699. e 2

A Brief Vindication OF THE *Fundamental Articles* OF THE Christian Faith,

AS ALSO

Of the *Clergy*, *Universities* and *Publick Schools*, from Mr. *Lock*'s Reflections upon them in his Book of *Education*, &c.

With some Animadversions on two other late Pamphlets, *viz.* Of Mr. *Bold* and a Nameless *Socinian* Writer.

By *John Edwards*, B. D.

LONDON: Printed for *J. Robinson* at the *Golden Lion*, and *J. Wyat* at the *Rose* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard, 1697.

THE
Epiſtle Dedicatory
TO BOTH
UNIVERSITIES.

HONOURED SIRS,

A *Late Writer hath taken the confidence to make very Diſreſpectfull, Indecent, Rude, and Scurrilous Reflections upon You, and hath with that Scorn and Inſolence, which are peculiar to him, and cannot be ſuppoſed to be in any other Man, cenſured your* Studies *and* Ways *and* Methods of Learning, *which are at this day own'd and practis'd by you. They have always born the brand of Infamy who have ſhew'd their ill will to theſe* Publick Schools of Education *and* Profeſſed Seminaries of Arts and

Literature. Pope Paul *the Second and* Sixtus *the Fourth who ſucceded him were infamous on this account, for both of them were obſerv'd to bear a Hatred to* Univerſities, *and publickly to declare their abhorrence of* Academick *Men and Learning. Mr.* Hobbes *is a Modern Inſtance, who was wont to decry the* Univerſity-Studies *and* Learning, *becauſe he had eſpouſed a Set of Notions which were deſtructive not only to Academick but all Religious Principles. But a later Inſtance we have in one Mr.* Lock, *who though he infinitely comes ſhort of the forenamed Perſon in Parts or Good Letters, yet hath taken the courage to tread in his Old Friend's ſteps, and publickly to proclaim his diſlike of* Univerſity-Men, *and to remonſtrate againſt the* Methods *they take in bringing up of Youth. The Name of* Publick Schools *and* Academies *is as hatefull to him as that of* Athanaſius *to a* Socinian.

Nor

Nor is he pleas'd with our Old Chriſtianity, *but hath offer'd a New Scheme to the World, the ſame (the very ſame in words, as well as to the Thing) with what Mr.* Hobbes *propounded as the Perfect and Compleat Model of Faith,* viz. To believe in Chriſt is nothing elſe than to believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt: and no other Faith, beſides this Article, is required to Eternal life. *De Cive cap.* 18. The belief of this Article, Jeſus is the Chriſt or Meſſias, is all the Faith required for Salvation. *Leviathan. Part.* 3. *Chap.* 43. *This is the Doctrine which is revived and furbiſh'd up in the pretended* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity: *and you ſee whence it is borrow'd. When that Writer was framing a* New Chriſtianity, *he took* Hobbes's Leviathan *for the* New Teſtament, *and the* Philoſopher *of* Malmsbury *for our* Saviour *and the* Apoſtles. *See how naturally a Man paſſes from arraigning*

raigning and vilifying the Univerſi-ties *to affront and abuſe* Religion! *He had with pride and contempt trampled upon the former, and now he attacks the latter, and treads* Chriſtianity *it ſelf under his feet.*

It may be few of you have taken notice of the Affronts done to your ſelves *by this Bold Aſſailant, as not buſying your ſelves with ſuch ſort of Writers, or as thinking ſuch Reflections below your Reſentments. But I having had occaſion to enter the Liſts with this* Gentle-man, *it falls in my way to take notice of his Double Inſolence, i. e. to* You *and to* Religion, *but more eſpecially the latter, which he hath miſerably ſhatter'd and unſettled, and almoſt reduced to nothing; having baulk'd a great part of the* Goſpels, *and wholly laid aſide the* Epiſtles, *and renounced all* Arti-cles of Chriſtianity *but* One *as neceſſary to be believ'd to conſtitute a Man a Chriſtian, and having every where*

ſhew'd

ſhew'd his diſdain of the Miniſtry *and* Miniſters of the Goſpel, *eſpecially the* Clergy of the Church of England. *So that he deſerves to be treated with* Satyr *rather than* Argument. *And therefore if there be in the enſuing Papers a kind of mixture of the former with the latter, I hope it will not be diſreliſh'd even by the moſt Serious and Judicious Readers when they conſider on whom it is beſtow'd.*

Gentlemen, I have now an opportunity of vindicating the Honour of thoſe Renowned *and* Learned Bodies *to which you belong, and likewiſe of aſſerting and defending the* Cauſe of Chriſtianity: *wherefore I thought I ſhould be defective as to both theſe Concerns if I did not offer theſe Papers to* You, *and humbly requeſt You to take them into your patronage, with the Author of them, who is,*

Moſt Learned Sirs,

Your entire Servant and Honourer

JOHN EDWARDS.

The Author to the Book-seller.

SIR,

YOu know Books Printed at *Cambridge* are commonly Licensed by the University, and accordingly when I designed the following Papers for the Press there, I requested Mr. *Vice-Chancellor* and the *Regius* Professor of Divinity to peruse them, which they did, and then returned them to me with an *Imprimatur*: and two other Heads of Colleges (for I applied my self to no more) were pleased to sign the same. The Form was thus:

April 17. 1697.

Imprimatur,

Hen. James Procan.
Jo. Beaumont Reg. Theol. Prof.
Jo. Covell S. T. P.
Jo. Balderston S. T. P.

But since I found it necessary to be printed at *London*, and that I might not seem neglectful of the favour and Kindness of the worthy Persons before mentioned; And that you and the Reader may see that the Ensuing Undertaking was so far approved of by those Learned Gentlemen, that they Licensed the Printing of it: I have thought fit for their Satisfaction and yours to set down their Names.

Your humble Servant J. E.

A Brief Vindication OF THE *Christian Faith*, &c.

AFter I had obſerved the rude and ſurly Genius of a late Penman, the *Author* and *Vindicator* of a Treatiſe which he entitules *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, I had a mind to ſee what was his Humour in ſome other of his Productions, and accordingly I look'd into his Papers of *Education*, and there I ſoon diſcover'd that it was his ſettled Nature and Temper to Traduce all ranks of Perſons, and that he had taught his Tongue to Revel, and that he can't write three Pages without thrice as many Calumnies and Falſhoods, and ſo I leſs wondered at his *Rudeneſs* to Me. There I found that he libels the moſt *Learned* and *Celebrated Societies* of Men in this Nation, that he ſtrives to blaſt the reputation of the moſt *Uſeful Perſons*, and to ridicule their *Publick Employments* and *Stations*, that with an ungovernable pride and diſdain he diſcards ſome *Arts* and *Sciences*, and laughs

at the *Professors* of them: And in brief, I found that he imperiously flies at all, and like some Barbarous Invader makes havock whereſoever he comes, and ſpares no Sex, Place, or Quality of Perſons. Of which I will now give the Reader ſome particular Inſtances, and undeniable proofs.

For I conceive it will not be expected that I ſhould firſt endeavour to make it clear, that the Author of *the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* is the ſame perſon that writ concerning *Education*, for all his Friends and Admirers, (who would not wrong him, we muſt think) make him the Father of both: And he owns it *himſelf*, for when I ſaluted him by the *name* of Mr. *Lock* in a late Treatiſe [The *Socinian Creed*. Chap. 6.] he readily anſwer'd to it. *In his Socinian Creed, p* 120. *he begins with M E*, ſaith he, Vindicat. p. 398. and afterwards in the ſame Page and the four following ones, he particularly applies to *himſelf* what I ſaid of him by *Name* in that Chapter; and he concludes p. 402. *This is all that is new, which I think My ſelf concern'd in, in his Socinian Creed.* This *All* is what I had ſaid concerning his *One Article*, and concerning his bauiking of the *Epiſtles*, and concerning his crying down of *Syſtems* with a deſign to eſtabliſh one of his own. All along I charg'd Mr. *Lock* with theſe things, to which the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity* ſubmiſſively replies, *I think* MY SELF *concern'd in all this*, which is as much as to ſay, I am Mr. *Lock* whom you mentioned ſo often in that Chapter. And we ſhall find in p. 424, 425.

of

of his *Second Vindication*, that he takes to *himself* whatever I had said with particular reference to Mr *Lock*, whom I expressly named in the foresaid Chapter. Here we see the *Masker* pulls off his Vizour, and after all his Disguises owns himself to bear that *Name* which I call'd him by. I think then I may proceed.

First, to give the Reader a right Idea of this Gentleman, I will take notice of his way of treating the *Universities* whether at home or abroad, for we must know that he is a Catholick Hater of them all, as appears from his scornful censuring and disparaging *the Learning now in fashion in the Schools of Europe*, page 158 of his *Thoughts of Education*, by which general terms he means the Formed *Academies* as well as the meaner *Schools* and Seats of Education which are in these *European* parts. Our Universal Railer spares neither Foreign Nurseries of Learning, nor those in his own Country. It is as easie to him with the same infectious Breath, to blast the one as the other. And his Pride and Arrogance prompt him to blow upon both, and to defy all Methods of *Education* but his own. But chiefly his spight is heightned against those Two Famous Seminaries of Learning which our own Nation is blessed with, and thence it is that they fall under such Benedictions as these from him, which I shall next take notice of. *The Tutours* (saith he) *think it their great business to fill the Studies and Heads of their Pupils with such Authors as these*, viz. *Burgersdicius* and *Schiebler*. p. 162. This is an unpardonable

fault, and therefore the Lash is due from our Severe *Educator*, and accordingly he here bestows it on the *Cambridg* and *Oxford* Tutors. I charge you, young Men, as I am Tutor General, not to deal in such Authors. Read *John Lock* who writ of *Humane Understanding*, and hath had little of it since, and not over much then. If you would *fill your Pupils heads* with Whimsies, there is a Book for you, If you would have *no Idea* of the Supreme Being, and a *false one* of Christianity, and a *fantastick one* of Good Manners, then *think it your great business* to fill your Studies with my *Essay*, and my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, and my *Thoughts of Education*. Though I know not whether *Burgersdicius* and *Schiebler* be Authors in fashion amongst the generality of Tutours at this time, but rather think they are not; yet if they have been, or are among some, it is enough to ground an Out cry upon. In the same page he tells us that *Burgersdicius*'s and *Schieblers did not swarm in* Seneca's *days, as they do now in these*. No, good Sir, nor did such Whimsical Writers as *John Lock* and *Sam. Bold* swarm in those days, as they do now. He very worshipfully urges *the little advantage of Logick*, p. 234. and presently after adds, that *the Skill of Reasoning well is seldom or never got by studying the Rules which pretend to teach it*. Again, in the same place, merely to disparage the *Academick* Studies, he tells us that *Right Reasoning is founded on some thing else than the Predicaments and Predicables, and consists not in talking in Mood and Figure*: But we know, Good Sir, it is inconsistent with talking against them. In

In an other place, p. 145. he hath a fling at *Latin* (as well as *Logick*) *brought from the University*. What would the Man be at? Is he againſt all *Latin*? It may be ſo, for what need he be at the pains to learn this Tongue when *Pedlars French* beſt ſuits his way of living, and thoſe he converſes with? And yet methinks this ſhould not be his meaning that he is for no *Latin* at all, for he may ſtand in need of it upon occaſion; the being able to read a little of it may ſerve him at a dead lift. Or, is he againſt *falſe Latin* only? One would think that ſhould not be, for this Half-quarter (if that be not too much) of a *Student in Phyſick and Chyrurgery*, hath not Skill to tell when *Priſcian*'s head is broken, or if he had, he hath not Art enough to heal it. Or, doth he rage only againſt the *Latin* that is *brought from the University*? Ay, there it is, I will warrant you: He imagines that it muſt be *brought by the Carrier* (and perhaps this fanciful Gentleman thinks *Hobſon* is alive ſtill) and muſt be paid for, and this Hide-bound Gripple Man (who lays up all againſt the next riſing and falling of *Guinea*'s) will not be at the charges.

But hearkʼ! there is a Terrible Broad-ſide coming, for by way of a Concluding Stroke he boldly tells us, that the *Education which is at this day in the Univerſity* (and by this way of ſpeaking you may perceive he intends one of our own Univerſities) is uſeleſs *for the World, and Mans Life*. Now we are ſunk, and never can riſe again. A Man of *Univerſity Education* is to be kickʼd out of the *World*,

and deſerves not to *Live* in it, becauſe he is not bred up according to the Rules of one Mr. *Lock*'s *Education*. His Univerſity Learning is not uſeful for the World, it will never make him a *Committee Man*, and help him to underſtand *Manufacture* and *Fiſhery*: And if it will not do that, what is it good for?

And this Lewd Declaimer is full of Invectives againſt the Perſons as well as the Studies of Univerſity Men, for he lets us know that the *young Tutour from the Univerſity is neither well-bred, nor skill'd in the world, nor well principled in the grounds and foundations of true vertue and generoſity*, p 145. His *Latin* and his *Logick* were bad, but his *Ethicks* are much worſe; he hath been fooling with *Burgerſdicius*, but hath not look'd into *Machiavel*, and thence principled himſelf with the grounds and foundations of true Vertue and Generoſity, which cannot be but from him alone. And then he is very ſharp again upon the Univerſity-Tutors becauſe *they are not well bred*, and *have not the knowledge of a man of Buſineſs*, p. 159. and have *no knowledge of the World*, p. 162, 163. and therefore are unfit to be *Tutors, and to read Lectures to Gentlemen, it being impoſſible* (as he adds) *that any one ſhould come forth well faſhion'd out of unpoliſh'd ill-bred company*, p 163. The Univerſities are this *unpoliſh'd ill-bred company*, and how then can a *well faſhion'd Tutor*, and one that is *fit to read Lectures to Gentlemen* proceed thence?

This is ths beſt Language Mr. *John Lock* can beſtow upon *Univerſity-Men*. He would have us know that *he* hath engroſſed all *Gentility*

lity and *Good Breeding* to himself, that *University-Air* inspires Men with Rusticity, and makes them errant *Boors* and *Peasants*, that a *Fellow of a College* is a *Clown*, and must be so by the *Statutes*, that *Tutors* are the worst of *Corydons*, and belong to the *Rabble* and *High Shoes*, that the *College Raven* hath more Manners than the *Scholars*, and that the very *Latin* which is brought from those places smells of *Barbarism*. Afterwards he rebukes the *Unmannerliness* and *Rudeness of Scholars*, p. 262. meaning the foresaid persons, and rattles them again for their want of *Good Breeding*. Again, in an other place he derides and scoffs at the *Liberal Arts*, *and the Tutors Learn'd Encyclopaidia*, p. 150. There is some unlawful *Magick* in this *Circle* of the Arts, and he would not have any one come within the Compass of it. In short, from what this *Tutorer of Tutors* hath let fly already against our present Academies, we may perceive him enclined to inveigh as heartily against them as *Culpeper* ever did against the *College* of *Physitians*. But the two Grand things which he upbraids them with are their Deficiency as to their *Learning*, and to their *Breeding*. With respect to both which, if he were indulged his Liberty, it is not to be doubted he would use such Language as this:

'The *Students* in the Universities, as well 'as the *Books* in the Great and Common Li- 'brary of one of them, are all *Chain'd*; they 'are Tied to certain Methods of Study, and 'their Authors are prescribed them. They 'live in perfect Durance, and the *Bocardo*

'and *Toll-booth* are but representations of their 'respective *Colleges*. At their very entrance 'they are imprison'd and Shackled, a *Burgersdicius* or some such *System-maker* is clapt into 'every youths hands, and they can't be matriculated without *Predicaments* and *Predicables*. There is nothing but Restraint and 'Imposition here. *Oxford* presents us with a *Bible* in its *Armorial Ensigns*, thereby pinning 'the *Epistles* upon us, as well as the rest of 'the Scripture. The *Light* and *Cups* (as *Sacred* as they are) of the other University 'are fantastick Emblems, and serve only to '*dazzle* and *intoxicate* the minds of the enslaved Pupils of *Alma Mater*; who (poor 'Souls) are *not skill'd in the World*, and understand not *Trade* and *Commerce*, and know 'not that *Sturbridg-Fair* is the best *Commencement*. Again, as their *Knowledg*, so their '*Breeding* is contemptible, for a Man cannot 'be a *Gentleman*, and read *Burgersdicius* and '*Scheibler*. *Logick* gives one an ill Mien and 'Shape, and therefore (as I hinted before) 'there is not a *well-fashion'd Tutor* among them. 'They have no more *Manners* than what is 'left in the bare *Motto* of the Founder of *New College*. If those of this University were 'remanded back to *Greke-lade* and *Leche-lade* '(their first Principles) those of the other 'were reduced to their old *Inns* and *Hostles*, 'it would be suitable to their merits: But it 'would be much more agreeable if they were 'remov'd out of the World. I ever thought 'that the best way to decide the Controversy 'between *Cains* and *Twyne* about the Antiquity

'quity of these Societies is to dissolve them 'both. They are so Useless and Insignificant 'a part of Mankind, so *Ill bred a Company*, 'that the Nation would not be a Farthing the 'worse if they underwent the same fate 'with the *Abbeys* and *Monasteries*. In short, 'I am one that like nothing which belongs to 'the *Ford* or the *Bridg*, No, not so much as 'the *Buildings* of the former, for in my judg-'ment *Lowse-Hall* is as good a Structure as the 'Theater. I see nothing that is *Genteel*, or 'Learned in either of the so much Celebrated 'Universities. Both their *Behaviour* and their 'Studies are to be abhor'd because they are 'not according to the Pattern of my *Seraglio* 'which I intend to publish to the World, and 'have partly done it in my *Education*.

But where then can we suppose this Raving *Tutor* and *Reformer* to have been bred, who thinks and talks after this rate? And to what Society doth he belong? If Charity did not give a Check here, we might mention the Famous and Renowned *Gymnasium* at the entrance of *Moor-fields*, that Academy of poor shatter'd Noddles, that Receptacle of Inflamed *Meninges*.

Because the *Universities* are constantly supplied from the *Publick Schools*, therefore it is no wonder that he who is a profess'd Enemy to those Higher and Supreme Seats of the Muses, shews his rancour against the Inferiour ones, and such as are in order to the other. He is severe upon *School-masters* (though not so severe as he every where complains they are upon their Boys) and their way of *Education*,

ducation, and will not entertain a favourable thought of any thing they do. As before I obſerved that he routed *Burgerſdicius*, ſo now he laughs at the Teachers of *Lily's Grammar*, p. 290, nay he would have *no Grammar at all*, p. 291. *The way of learning Latin in a Grammar-School* he declares againſt with great ſupercilioufneſs, p. 291. He would not have *any Language learnt by Grammatical Rules*, p. 288. but only by *roat*, p. 295. In an other place he ſhews his diſlike not only of *Logical Diſputes* (which is a Touch to the *Academick* Gentlemen) but of *Set Declamations*, and very vigorouſly appears againſt *making Latin Themes and Declamations*, p. 297. and 7 pages more, not only becauſe he was ſo dull at theſe Exerciſes when he was in his Boyſhip, but becauſe it is, as he ſaith, *the Vulgar Method of Grammar Schools*, which he hath a ſtrange Antipathy againſt, and is ſo weak and indiſcreet as to diſcover it by ill Language. Surely *the fear of the School-Maſters Rod* (which with ſome emotion and trembling he mentions p. 268. and in other places) was betimes begot in his mind by his early deſerving it: And that frightful Idea made ſo deep an impreſſion on his thoughts, that it will continue with him all his days, and he will ever have a fling at that *Inſtrument of Education*, as he calls it.

A Publick-School is the worſt of Priſons, that which we ſilly folks call a *Free-School* is a houſe of Bondage with him, *the Children are chain'd to the Oar ſeven, eight, or ten years*, p. 268. Again, in the ſame place, *They are put into the Herd, and driven with a Whip or Scourge*,

Scourge, &c. This is very sad and lamentable indeed, they are both Slaves and Beasts. You Gentlemen that are Masters of the Great Schools in *London*, *Westminster*, *Eton*, *Winchester*, and all the rest of you that are of that so Useful and Honorable Employment, you are all of you a company of *Tyrants*, *Oppressors*, *Task-masters*, *Herd-drivers*, *Overseers of Gallies*: You unmercifully as well as unjustly treat the poor Children that are under you, cruelly chaining them to the Oar, and at the same time driving them like Beasts, as this Man of Sense expresses it. And you that are their *Parents*, how unreasonable do you act when you put them to School? You commit them to the *Common Gaol* (as you know *Westminster-School* is but one Remove from the *Gate-house*) you enter them *Gally-slaves*, and you make their condition equal with that of your very Brutes: And all this you do to *get them a little Latin and Greek, which might be had at a great deal cheaper rate of pains and time*, p. 268. And then after all this, you and their Masters give some of them their Mittimus to the Universities, where they are in Bondage and Jail again: There they tug at the Oar, there they run the Gantlet through *dry Systems of Logick and Philosophy*, p. 164. yea (which is worse, far worse) dull *Systems of Divinity*, p. 283. So that it seems not only the *Logick*, but the *Philosophy*, and the *Divinity* of the Universities are expos'd by this Instructer Paramount. No Books what soever that contain any *Set Rules* (so he phrases it) of any Art, even *Grammar* it self, must be taught

taught or sold; and so St. *Paul's School* and *Church-yard* must both of them be laid aside together. Hence we may interpret what he saith p. 267. where he calls himself a *Bookish man*, not because of his reading of Books, but because of his condemning the Sale of them. What think you? Is this not a new sort of *Bookish man*? What think you? doth he speak like one that is in a Post *for the encouraging and improving of Trade in this Kingdom*?

I had almost forgot an other freak of our *New Tutour*, and that is his undervaluing and vilifying of *Musick* and *Poetry*, two signs of an Ill-natured man, and one that hath a Harsh and Untun'd Soul. The former he censures, together with the Persons that are Masters of it, p. 346. telling us that *he hath scarcely heard among men of Parts and Business any one commended or esteemed for having an Excellency in Musick*. And it hath the *last place* among all Accomplishments according to our Gruff Tutour, p. 347. The latter viz. *Poetry* is condemn'd by him p. 302. where he is falling upon the Schoolmasters, and their way of educating of Youth. *If a Child hath a Poetick vein, it is to me*, saith he, *the strangest thing in the world that the Father should desire, or suffer it to be cherish'd or improved*, p. 302. He would have *the Parents stifle and suppress it as much as may be*, p. 303. *His School master must not so much as entice him to Versifying*, p. 304. Yea our Rough Reformer, who can rail now in Prose, is against *making of Verses, Verses of any sort*, p. 302. Who gives us a taste of the strange Genius of this Protector, and shows that he prefers

his

his own Conceits and Whims to the judgment of the Wise, and that he hath the hardiness to censure and defame all those Brave Men of our own and other Countries that have been esteem'd and honour'd for their excellent Poetick Vein, and by their Ravishing Number have obliged the Learned World, as some of them by their Pious Raptures have been extreamly serviceable to Religion. But neither *Universities* nor *Schools*, nor the *Studies* and *Arts* they profess, nor the *Persons* that teach or learn them, the *Books* which are read by them can find any acceptance with our Quaint *Educator*. If he be for any *University*, it is *Rakow*, though as yet he defers his *Matriculation*. If he be for any Library, besides his own Set of Books, it is *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, though he pretends he hath read nothing in it.

That the true Worth of this Gentleman, who is now under our consideration, may be further evidenced out of his Writings, and that the world may see that he who defames the *Academick* Bodies is disposed to be a Catholick Railer, I will in the next place remind the Reader how abusively he treats the *Nobility* and *Gentry* of this Realm who send their sons to *Travel*. He ridicules both the *Father* and the *Mother*, upbraiding the one for his Want, for *he cannot stay any longer for the Portion, which is to come into his hands when his Son is married*; and jeering the other for her Fondness and Childishness, for *she must have new babies to play with*. p 372. And my *Young Master* is laugh'd at for his *Marrying*

and

and *Propagating* as if theſe were two Ridiculous things, eſpecially the former. This would well enough become a Town-Wit and have paſs'd in a Play, but it ſounds odly and prodigiouſly from a Grave Tutour, from a Stanch Metaphyſitian, from a Formal Breeder up of Youth, and from one who lays down *Rules of Civility, Good Manners, and Breeding*, p. 256, 257, 258, *&c.* and in ſeveral other places inculcates this that a Teacher and Governor of Children (of which rank he thinks himſelf the Chief) muſt be a *well-bred man*, nay *he muſt not fail to be a well bred man*, he muſt be *exactly well bred.*

Surely ſome Perſons of Honour of either Sex will ſet a Mark on that foreſaid paſſage in his book, and obſerve the Lightneſs and Scurrility of his expreſſions, and in the Margin note this, that this Writer hath no regard to his own Rules, that he teaches men to trample upon his own Dictates, and that he gives the world to underſtand that his Foppiſh Gravity is to be hiſs'd at. If there were ſome real ground for what he ſaith, yet a Writer of a book on purpoſe (as he pretends) to chaſtiſe the *Indiſcretion* and *Ill Breeding* of others, would not have uſed terms of that nature. Or, if a diſcreet man had cenſured the practice it ſelf, yet he would have been careful to do it without thoſe unmannerly and indecent Reflections on a great part of the preſent *Nobility* of our Kingdom, with others of the *Gentry*. Or, if he had made bold with *my Young Maſter* (as he calls him) yet he might have forborn reflecting ſo rudely on their *Honourable Parents*,

rents, and speaking so disrespectfully of some on whom our Dependence hath been, and making himself and the reader merry with his Lampoons upon them. Is this the man that cries up himself for the Gift of *Educating*? Is this deportment which I have been mentioning the Character of a *Well-bred man*? Or is it not rather the Idea and Pourtraiture of an *Ill-bred* and *Wandring Pedagogue*, of an *Itinerant Tutour* who scampers from one Shire to an other, to give documents about *reading Reynard the Fox* p. 279. which he calls *Education*, and hath writ a Book about it?

He flings at the *Reverend Judges*, by fixing a Pasquil upon one of them, p. 105, 106. of his *Second Vindication*. Which is either true or false; if we can suppose the former, yet no Discreet man would publickly mention it, out of respect to the Honourable Robe. Especially this Writer should not have exposed any of that Order, seeing he had particularly commended and urged *decency of words*, p. 256. *Educat.* and had declared that *it is the part of a Well-bred Man to express a respect to persons according to their Rank and Condition.* p. 258. But on the other hand, if this Imputation be *false*, then he deserves to fall into the hands of those *Ministers of Justice*, and to be sentenced according to his Crime. But I return to his Treatise of *Education*.

It is observable that the *Softer Sex* have found no Protection from this Rough Man. He is not only an University Hater but a Hater of Women. He exposes the behaviour of two *Ladies of Quality*, that fell out with

one

one an other in Company, and relates the Particulars of it. p. 265, 266. It is likely that one or both of them have been told of this paſſage in his book, and they can't but think it is an Affront to them, and muſt needs be ſo far from believing him to have any of that *Good Breeding* which he pretends to teach the world, that they will rather ſtigmatize him as a *Scandalous Blab* that tells all he hears, a *Tom Coriat* that relates whatever he picks up in his perambulations. Joyn this with his Reflections on thoſe Perſons of Honour before mention'd, and then give me your opinion of the *Breeding* of our *Cenſorious Tutour*.

That he hath an Antipathy to the *Whole Sex*, one would gueſs from what falls from his Pen, p. 14. *If women were themſelves to frame the bodies of their children in their wombs, we ſhould certainly have no perfect children born*, which perhaps may go down very glib with his Admirers, but you ſee he ventures to border upon Prophaneneſs and Blaſphemy rather than he will not expreſs his diſlike of the *Female* Order. Whether this be done in revenge to the Sex, who generally, where *ſome body* comes, dub him *the Hard-favour'd Man*, and ſometimes upon occaſion make uſe of him to *ſcare their Children*, I will not diſpute. Or it may be he that hath been uſed to play with the Young Ones, thinks he may make bold to be rude even with the Mothers. Elſe he would not have given them the odious name of *Munkies*, p. 15, and in reproach have called the Houſe of Office *Madam Cloacina*, p. 36. This is the cleanly, genteel,

and

and polite language of *John Lock* that writes himself *Gent.* And this stile and behaviour are the more strange because they are observ'd in one that hath been freely admitted to the Concerns of that Sex.

I might here harmlesly divert the Reader with his *Scotchhoppers* and *Dibstones*, p. 115, 237, 275. with his Documents about *Milk-potage* and *Water-Gruel* p. 18. and his teaching Children to *evacuate* dextrously, p. 33 to p. 38. Which latter succeeds only when the Party is present, it being promoted by his *Vespasian*-Looks. *He hath spent some time*, he saith, *in the study of Physick*, p. 40, and especially of the *Guts*, which he very feelingly and concernedly discourses of p. 34, 35, 36. as if they were that part of the Body which he most minds. Which is one reason perhaps why he hates *Colledg-Commons*, and for their sake the *Universities*.

But I will not make any farther Additions, because I will not prevent my self in what I design at an other time, and because what I have before produced out of his Pages is sufficient to convince us what a Talent of *Education* he hath, and how fit a person he is to have Youth committed to his charge. *He hath been consulted of late*, he saith, *by many about the breeding of their children*, Epist. Ded. but let me request such to *consult* their Reason, and demand of that to tell them whether a Rash *Censor* of the Studies and Learning of our own Academies, whether a Rude Reviler of those in the most Honourable Station, whether a Defamer of Laudable Arts, whe-

ther a Supercilious Innovator and a Fantaſtick Reformer in the Methods of Teaching, and laſtly whether a Corrupter of our Holy Faith, and a profeſs'd Depraver of the Chief Articles of the Chriſtian Religion (of which I ſhall ſpeak anon) be a perſon fit to be *conſulted about the breeding of their Children.* The *Orthodox* Parents (and I hope we have ſome of them left in England ſtill) will ſurely be caution'd by this not to commit them to this bold Patron of ſo Bad a Cauſe, who prides himſelf in his *Heterodoxy*, and boaſts that he hath renounced the receiv'd doctrines of the *Chriſtian Church.*

And thus having in a preliminary way deſcanted on ſome part of his book concerning *Education*, that the Reader might thence have ſome inſight into the Man I was to deal with, I ſhall proceed now to take notice of his other Papers, which relate to *Religion*: for his *New Education* was in order to the introducing of a *New Religion.* He had ſpoken before againſt the *Learning in faſhion*, and now he comes to cenſure *the Religion in faſhion*, (as he calls it) and the *Faſhionable* and *Titular Profeſſors* of it (as he Stiles them, p 93) *i. e.* the eſtabliſh'd *Miniſters* of it. He had ſhew'd his perverſe ſpirit in his Notions about the breeeding up of *Children*: next he will try how ſucceſsful he can be in the perverting of *Men.* He will ſee what he can do with *Grown people*, as well as with his *Young Maſters.* Having taken upon him to reform the Univerſities and Schools, and to caſt off their Studies and Learning, he is encouraged to go on,

on, and to reform Religion, and to give us a New Model of Christianity. Accordingly he publish'd a Treatise entituled *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, wherein he pretends to teach the world what they have been so long ignorant of, *viz.* that if a man acknowledg a God, there is but *One Article of Christian Belief* which is necessarily required to be embraced by him in order to the constituting him a Christian. As for all other Articles and Doctrines delivered by Christ and his Apostles in the Writings of the New Testament, he pronounces them to be unnecessary and useless as to the making a man a Christian, and capacitating for Life and Salvation. This Novel Conceit, which is an unwarrantable Restraining and Confining of the Christian Faith, and makes Christianity a far different thing from what it is represented by our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, hath been *Vindicated* by him once and again. And as I thought my self obliged to reflect upon his *First Vindication* in a Discourse which I published, and entituled *Socinianism Unmask'd*, so now I am designing to attack his *Second Vindication*, and by exactly setting down his *own words* (which I shall very faithfully do) and by impartially examining them, to convince the Unbiass'd Reader of the Vanity, Weakness and Inconsistency, of the Absurdity, Falshood and Dishonesty of his Arguing: and on the contrary to establish this Doctrine in mens minds, that *there are More Articles then One in the Christian Religion which are the necessary and indispensable matter of*

our Faith, in order to our being True Christians.

Only first let me be permitted to observe how the *Vindicator*, to bubble the Reader, insinuates that in my *Socinianism Unmask'd* I used *ill language* and *railing*; and again in the same place (his *Preface*) he complains of my Stile as *rude* and *scurrilous*: whereas any impartial Reader may satisfy himself that I always kept my self close to the matter which was before me, I attended to the Merits of the Cause, and made no Reflections but what his way of Discoursing drew from me. I will not deny that I labour'd to assert the Truth with that Concern and Earnestness, that Zeal and Ardour which so Good a Cause deserves. I don't love to dally with the Grand Articles of our Religion, for I look upon Languid and Timerous Assertors of Evangelical Truths as a sort of Betrayers of them. There is as much of *Judas* as *Nicodemus* in such persons. It is one of the most Ominous Defects and Miscarriages of this Age that such numbers of men are Faint and Indifferent in matters of this nature. I thank God I am not of so Phlegmatick a Mold, I have not so groveling and dastardly a spirit as tamely to suffer this Upstart Adversary to shock Religion, and pervert the Faith, and not to stand up in defence of it, and to detect his Errors and Cheats. Therefore I am now treated as his Mortal *Enemy, because I tell him the Truth*, and that without timerous mincing of it. It is this that hath rais'd in him an Angry and Malicious Ferment, and hath made him rage and huff, and fill the world with Clamours.

* One

* One hath rightly observ'd concerning his *Second Vindication* that it is *an Angry piece of work*, and that he was *in a Storm* whilst he was writing it. It is easily discernable that all along he is swell'd with Coler and Revenge. Being touch'd home, he equally raves against the *Truth* and *Me.*

We see the Physick hath work'd, as all the Filth and Excrements of his Papers shew. *Dirt* and *Ordure*, and *Dunghills* are the frequent embelishments of his Stile. I am charg'd with *popular calumnies*, *falshood*, *absurdity*, *bawling*, *talking at random*, *malicious untruth*, *leger-de-main.* Nay, I am a *Conjurer*, though I never took *him* to be such. I am a *petulant Scold*, I am *Villainous*, and I am e'en what he pleases. I am sometimes an *Innocent* with him, and sometimes a *Jesuite* (for our Scurrilous Tutour is very happy in his wise and significant tacking of Calumnies together.) I'm a Reprobate with him as to my *Parts* and *Breeding.* I am honour'd with the Epithets of a *Buffoon*, and (with an *Innuendo*) a *Devil.* I have *Lying* and *Impudence* laid to my charge. Yea, this *Well-bred Governour*, calls me a *downright Impudent Liar.*

And abundance of such *Rhetorical Flowers* I could present the Reader with out of the *Vindicator*'s Garden, for you must know that though he is a deadly Enemy to *Poetry*, yet he is a Great *Rhetorician.* The Strangeness of the Scene is, that though he plentifully Rails every where, yet he cries out against me as if

* Occasional Paper. Numb. 5. p. 38.

I did ſo. It is plain that he would ſuffer no body to Rail but himſelf: He is clearly for the Monopoly of this Trade. He ſeems to be of the Humour of him that would let no body where he was Swear but himſelf, Let him then engroſs the whole Commodity, I'll not pretend to be a Sharer or Rival with him. One that hath ſpent the greateſt part of his time among Nurſes and Goſſips and the Loquacious Fry, is not to ſeek in the Art of Scolding, nay is ſuppoſed to Excel in it. To ſuch a one I am ready to give the Precedence, becauſe I queſtion whether any of the Siſterhood at *Billingſgate* can outſtrip him.

This Thorow-paced Railer flies to *Perſonal Reflections*, that is, ſuch as he counts to be of that nature, or elſe he would not have fill'd his Papers with them. I am a *Preacher*, and a *Pulpit-Orator*, p. 61, 206, 352, 386. which are very ſcandalous imputations with him: Wherefore he often inſiſts upon theſe, and touches upon my *Pariſh* and *Pariſhioners*, p,203. and the very naming of an *Uſe of Exhortation*, p. 393. is a Jeſt, and a piece of Stinging Wit with him. In one place, p. 143. he is ſo Logical, that he infers I am no Good *Arguer* or *Writer* becauſe I am a *Preacher*. And yet he will grant that a Man may be a *Commiſſioner for Trade* to the *Barbado's*, and yet be a Good *Writer*. But whether he can be ſo as he is a *Conceited Tutor*, I leave to be conſider'd. He hath ſuch a rude way of treating the moſt Eminent Perſons (as you heard before) that I could not expect to eſcape him who am in an other Level. But it is obſervable, that whileſt he

he maliciously strikes at *me*, he defames most of the Best Writers of our Age, who are known to be *Preachers and Pulpit Orators*, and this hath been the main Employment of their Lives. Nay, I could take notice that in his *Vindication* he uses the Testimonies and Authorities (though it is true he hath mistaken them) of some of those *Writers* that have been famed for their *Preaching* and *Pulpit Oratory*. Now, if *Preachers* be no *Arguers*, then why doth he make use of their Authority? If they be, why doth he vilify them? Good Mr. *Vindicator*, be perswaded to leave off these Contradictions and Nonsense. But any discerning man may see that here (as well as in several other places of his *Vindication*, and some of his other Writings) his design was to ridicule the *Sacred Office of Preaching*, and to blast the whole *Function*. We may guess what honourable thoughts he hath of it when he attempts to apply the term *Post*, in way of a rascally Quibble, to the *Ministry*, and the *Persons* concern'd in it, p. 422. Therefore his *Bitter Reflections on the Ministers of the Gospel and their Office*, are deservedly taken notice of and censured by a late Writer. *Occasional Paper*, Num. 1. and Num. 5. Truly there should be some care taken of this Gentleman; for the very mentioning of *Preaching*, though it be from his own mouth, inflames his blood, renews his Frenzy, and makes him Rave. This poor crazed *Tutor* should be look'd after, and soundly dosed with Hellebore, lest in the fits of his over-heated Brain he should lash out, and revenge himself on the

Wainſcot of our *Pulpits*, and with them of the *Reading Pews*, for the ſake of the *Epiſtles*, (of which hereafter:) And it is well if our whole Bibles eſcape his fury for the ſame reaſon.

But our Scolding Tutor falls upon me again p. 30. and now the Topick is *Preferment*, and *Admiſſion to Preferment in the Church of* England, p. 24. It may be this is done to invite me to take notice of *his Preferments*; and therefore though he be ſo rude as to upbraid me for my want of *Titles* and *Dignities*, yet I ſhall be ſo Civil to him as to acknowledge and recount thoſe which he is Maſter of. I own him to be *Cenſor-General* of the *Logick* and *Latin* of the Univerſities, *Corrigidore* and *Regulator* of all the *Publick Schools* in Chriſtendom, *Great Maſter* of the *Anti-Academick Order*, *Tutor in Eyre* and *Controller* to the Youth of Seven Counties, *Curator in Ordinary* to *Coſtive Paunches*, *Principal Secretary* to the *Deiſts Office*, *Feoffee in Truſt* for *Sozzo's Pupils*, &c. And I beg his pardon that I forgot to mention thoſe Offices and Places before.

He is at me again, p. 67. and obliquely inſinuates (for he is full of his Squinting Hints) that I am for that Maxim, *The Doctrines in faſhion, and likely to procure Preferments, are alone to be received*, and ſo would imply that I am ready to receive any Doctrines in faſhion, be they never ſo Unreaſonable or Impious, and that Gain will tempt me to this or any thing elſe. Why, I tell you, Sir, you are in the wrong box, I am not the man you take

take me for, I was never hired to write for the *lowering of Guineas*, I never sought or held a Place with the forfeiture of my Honesty, and therefore I defy your Impotent Raillery not only against me, but against the Whole *Clergy*, High and Low, for you look upon them all as Mercenary, and that *they receive no Doctrines but what are in fashion, and are likely to procure Preferment.* Which you have learnt from your Brethren of *Racovia*, who tell us that the *Church of England men* are or would be * *Pensioners of the World.*

Behold the Insolence of our Libertine, who hath had the sway among Children, and hath Lord-Mayor'd it over Nurses and Chair-women! He hath been so worship'd and obey'd by the Striplings, and hath had such an absolute command of their Legs and Hats, that he expects the like submission and obeysance from all others, and he thinks he may say any thing, and not be opposed, for he cannot brook Contradiction. But I shall force him to it, and seeing he hath thought good to Riot thus with his Pen, he must not think to go untouch'd. Seeing he hath taken the liberty to reflect on my Calling and Function (and therein hath abus'd all of the same Character with my self) he must not take it ill if I sometimes glance upon the Post he is in, and his Studies and Employments. If I follow so laudable an Example as his, he is oblig'd to pardon me, and to remember that he was the Aggressor.

And

* Answer to the Archbishop's Sermon, p. 44.

And though indeed we are forbid to *answer* such people *according to their folly*, yet in some Circumstances, *i. e.* when *Pride* and *Conceit*, and such like Ingredients are mix'd with their *Folly*, we are permitted by the Wise Man to *answer them according* to the merits of their willful and affected *folly*, *lest they should be wise in their own conceit*, lest they should be hardned in their Pride and Arrogance, and think themselves *Wise* because no body checks and bridles their *folly*. Indeed it is almost a Reproach to a man to encounter such an Adversary, who hath the second time gull'd the world with false Stories, and abandoning all shame and ingenuity, given himself up to obstinate resolves of maintaining a Cause which will prove so mischievous to *Christendom*: An Adversary that hath no sense of what he doth, but is blinded and infatuated by Prejudice, so that he hath left himself no power to judge of his own words or actions. Which renders him a person not fit to be treated with that respect and deference which are due to an Ingenuous and Civil Opponent. To use him Gently, is to handle a Bear with Ceremony and Caution. And sometimes he is not worth a *Serious Reply*, for he Cheats the people, and then makes Sport of it. But however, though I shall be somewhat free with him, yet I will not thrust upon the Reader any thing that is indecent, rude, spiteful, or entrenching upon Truth. When we deal with such men, our *Master*'s Example forbids us to *revile again*, but the Apostle allows us, nay commands us to *rebuke them sharply*; I shall not be thought per-

perhaps to be defective in this, but none can censure me for Excess if they consider what the Badness of his design (as well as the Petulancy of his Stile) required. But where he gives me any scope for *Arguing* and *Reasoning* the case, I have with great seriousness applied my self to it, and I hope I have establish'd the Truth upon firm and solid grounds.

I will begin with his *Preface* to his *Vindication*, where he inserts a very Gracious *Epistle* to Mr. *Bold*, his late *Convert*, and now *Confederate*, and there pretends to tell him the *Birth* of his *Reasonableness of Christianity*. It was begot (if you will believe the Father of it) on *the Controversy of Justification*: He might have as well have said on the Controversy of *Predestination*: for it as much belongs to one as the other: And so you see it was a mere *By-blow*, and worthy of the Parent. But he is extremely fond of this Spurious Issue, and applauds himself for being the Author of it. *The first view I had of it*, saith he, *seem'd mightily to satisfy my mind. I wonder that every body did not see and embrace it, though Systems of Divinity said nothing of it. I was pleas'd*, saith our *Narcissus*, *with the growing discovery, every day, whilest I was employ'd in this search.* And more to the same purpose in the same Epistle. Then he proceeds to applaud the *Godfather* of this Brat Mr. *Bold*. Concerning whom he declares, that *he hath more readily entertain'd, and more easily enter'd into the meaning of his Book than most* (he might have said *any*) *he hath heard*

speak

ſpeak of it. And afterwards, *Mr.* Bold *hath enter'd into the true ſenſe of my Treatiſe, and his notions perfectly agree with mine.* And therefore he muſt needs be (as he ſtiles him) a *Calm Chriſtian*, a *Grave Divine*, a *Man of Parts*, a *Well-bred Man.* And *he hath* (if you'll credit our Encomiaſt) *a ſettled repute*, &c. Would you know the reaſon of all this Coakſing? It is no other than this, that ſame Mr. *Bold* who was *Sponſor* for the Baſtard brood, had in a late Pamphlet mightily extoll'd the Dad of it, Mr. *Lock.* He calls him the *Ingenious Author* of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, Rep p. 3. and *that great and eminent Perſon*, p. 27. (It is a ſign ſo when one of ſo *little* ſenſe and diſcretion votes him to be ſuch.) He is *no Diſparagement to the Cauſe*, he ſaith, p 27. and there is a good reaſon for it, I muſt tell him, for as a Perſon, ſo a Cauſe that hath nothing of worth in it, is not capable of being diſparaged: Poor Creature, he thinks it a great matter to have One Pen (beſides his own) wagging on his ſide. He is mightily rejoyc'd that he hath got a *Single Patron* for his *Single Article*, and is over-joy'd at ſuch Fulſom Encomiums thrown upon him, and therefore he heaps up as many as he can on the other's head. The ſum of all which is this, CLAW ME, AND I WILL CLAW THEE.

It is worth the obſerving that the *Vindicator* ſubſcribes himſelf at the cloſe of his *Letter* to Mr. *Bold* (which in a conceited manner he claps into the *Preface*) his *moſt humble ſervant. A. B.* Upon which theſe ſhort Remarks

marks may be made, 1. That he is ashamed of his *Name*, and that with good reason. 2. He is ashamed of his *Cause* and dares not Personally own it, and set his Name to the defence of it. This and the former may be reckon'd as the only Instances of *Shamefacedness* and *Modesty*, that the man was ever guilty of. But 3. We may gather from those two letters which he hath affixed to the end of his Epistle *Who* he is, for though he hath only set down A. B. yet he hath left us to add the next letter C, and then we know what person is meant, *viz.* a Breeder up of Boys to learn their First Rudiments, a Learned Teacher of A B C. concerning which you may find more p. 272, 273. *Educat.*

From the *Preface* and *Epistle* I pass to the Book it self, the first part of which is spent in the old known way of *Malefactors* at the Bar: they are always willing to evade the *Charge*, to insist upon the little Niceties, and on the Formality of words, and the Exact Punctilio's of Matter of Fact. This is the practise of our Criminal, p. 6, 7. and he thinks thereby to palliate his Guilt. He is loth to own it, for he knows his demerit, and the Consequence of it. He is to be excus'd indeed for this, or rather there is a known *Proverb* that excuses him: that makes him so backward to *Confess*. I have given an account of this matter in my *Socinianism Unmask'd* p. 5, 6. and have also shew'd since that the Formal Words are agreed to by his late Proselite. So that his own Gizzard, Mr. *Bold*, comes

comes in Evidence againſt him, and lets us know that we have no reaſon to liſten to him when he waves the Enditement. He will ſay and unſay, as it comes into his head, and will put the Reader off with any ſhuffling ſuggeſtions, merely to evade what I had juſtly lay'd to his charge. One of his great Cavils is that *I alledge matter of fact, but do not juſtify the Allegation*, p 2 and 7. and undertakes to prove it from *my pretending* (as he ſaith) *to know and deliver his thoughts*, p. 8. *This* (ſaith he there) *is an Inſtance of Falſe Allegations in matters of Fact, and ſuch as are not capable of a Negative proof.* Such poor, little, trifling ſtuff doth he obtrude upon the Reader; as if one that had read his Writings could not in a probable way tell what his *thoughts* of ſuch a ſubject were; unleſs you will ſay he diſſembled when he wrote, and this perhaps is it which he means when he ſaith there concerning me, that *that I affirm what I do not know.* And ſo you ſee what he hath got by caviling againſt what I alledged, he hath before he was aware let the world know that he believes not what he writes, that his Thoughts and his Pen hold no correſpondence, that when he pleads for *One Article only*, he doth not think that there is but One, but however he deſigns to root out All by reducing all the Articles of Chriſtianity to One. Who would attend to any of his *Objections*, when it is plain that it is not his buſineſs to ſearch out Truth, but to betray it?

He hath nothing to ſay to what I replied to his former *Vindication*, and therefore now to cheat

cheat the world, and amuſe the Reader, and to give farther proof of his daring Confidences, he bids me p. 9, 25, 72, *&c.* go to work again, 1. to prove that there are theſe words in his Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *viz.* that *Nothing is required to be believed by a Chriſtian, as abſolutely neceſſary to make him ſuch, but this Propoſition, Jeſus is the Meſſias:* 2. to prove that *he ſet himſelf on purpoſe to find but one Article of Faith:* 3. to prove that *he contends for One Article of Faith with excluſion and defiance of all the reſt:* 4 to prove that *the believing of Jeſus to be the Meſſias is not the only Article ſufficient to make a man a Chriſtian.* And ſeveral other things he calls upon me to prove, and the ſilly Accountant *ſcores* them up as he goes along, and ſets down the *Figures.* And he would not have left off where he doth, but that the Innocent had number'd as far as he could go. There is not one Particular he mentions, which I have not proved and evinc'd in my *Socinianiſm Unmask'd:* and therefore I ſcorn, at the motion of ſuch a Whiffling Objector, ſuch a Crude Repeater of what he had ſaid before in his *Firſt Vindication*, but now hath lately vamp'd up, and ſent abroad again, I ſcorn (I ſay) to produce the ſame Proofs again, and to affront the Reader with Needleſs Repetitions, which is the guiſe of this trifling Writer.

But ſeeing our *A B C darian* calls to me over and over again *to prove this*, and *to prove that*, I will now put *him* upon *Proving*, and ſee how he will diſcharge that part. In order to this I am to acquaint the Reader that this

this Gentleman in his *Former Vindication* call'd for a *List of Fundamental Articles*, i.e. such as the Holy Scripture represents to us as requisite to be known and believ'd, that we may be True Christians. I obey'd the demands of this pert *Vindicator*, and perform'd the Task which he was pleas'd to set me: in my first Chapter of my forenamed Treatise I assign'd a considerable number of Articles of the Christian Faith, as absolutely necessary to be known, *i. e.* so far as they can be known, for there are Great and Profound *Mysteries* couch'd in some of them, so that I had reason to say they were in *some measure* (which expression the *Vindicator* vainly objects against p. 70.) to be known and understood, and to be believ'd: and I particularly and distinctly proved that all of them are of that nature, and consequently no man can be *a Christian* without a competent knowledge and belief of these Doctrines. I also there propounded a *General Rule* whereby all such Articles and Doctrines may be discern'd; *i. e.* they may be known to be such from the *Nature* of the things contained in them, for no Evangelical Truths are absolutely and indispensably necessary to be known and to be assented to in order to the constituting of us Christians but those that *have Immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of Mans Redemption and Salvation.* But our Vindicator attempts not in the least to invalidate this Description of *Necessary Articles*; nay though he mentions it again p. 130. yet he can't invent any thing to object against it, only

ly

ly asks this and the other *Queſtion* nothing to the purpoſe. Our bold Reformer in Divinity ſcribles on, and ſhews not himſelf concern'd to diſprove what I propounded and aſſerted. No: he doth not ſo much as pretend to it. But he quarrels and ſhuffles, and makes a long Harangue about the Set Number of Fundamental Articles, and enquires p. 69. whether there be neither *more nor leſs* then I have aſſign'd. Which is nothing to the purpoſe, for Chriſtianity conſiſts not, as this Narrow ſoul'd Man would ſuggeſt, in a Point. If *he* will make it his buſineſs to ſcore them up, ſo let him; it is none of mine.

I have aſſign'd ſeveral Articles of Neceſſary Belief, I have particularly Enumerated ſuch Doctrines as have all the Marks of being *Fundamental*. Let him prove that they have not thoſe Marks, or let him take what courſe he pleaſes to prove that they are not Fundamental Truths, and ſuch as ought to be known and aſſerted to in order to make us Chriſtians: and when he hath done this particularly and diſtinctly, I will be at leiſure to tell him whether I think there be any more that belong to the Foundation. I have done my part, I have proved that *more then One Article* is abſolutely requiſite to make a man a Chriſtian, and yet he is ſtill craving, and *calls* to me, and *demands*, and *requires*, and *challenges* me to prove this and that, and yet will not prove any thing himſelf. This is a Mad way of Writing, to boaſt ſtill of his *One Article*, and yet not ſhew that any one of theſe Articles which I nam'd ought not to be added to it.

This is the buſineſs he ſhould have undertaken, and therefore for the future I expect that he either allows of thoſe *Articles* as Fundamental or elſe particularly ſhew that they are not. Pray ſet your ſelf to this work, and prove (if you can) that all thoſe Articles which I have mention'd are not neceſſary to be believ'd, to make men Chriſtians: and by that time you have done this, I ſhall find you freſh employment which will hinder a mans jaunting to my *Young Maſters* houſes, and his going a Gooding.

And the Juſtice and Fairneſs of my dealing with him will appear from this, that I hold him to his own Rule: *The Rule of Fair Diſpute*, ſaith he, *is to prove where any thing is denied: to Evade this is ſhuffling.* p 451. He ſtiffly *denies* that thoſe Propoſitions which I aſſign'd are neceſſary to be believ'd, for the conſtituting a man a Chriſtian: I call upon him to *prove* it, I have made it evident that they are all of them Fundamental Articles, but he will not own them to be ſuch: then I ſay, Prove the contrary. I *expect* this of you, I *demand* and *require* it of you, and *will inſiſt upon it* (to uſe your own peremptory ſtile.) Your Talk is this, to prove that thoſe doctrines of the Goſpel which I enumerated are not as neceſſary to be known and believ'd, to conſtitute a man a Chriſtian, as that One Article which they have nam'd. And when you have tried what you can do towards a proof of this, I'll tell you then what I have more to ſay to you. But you ſee I put you upon following your *own Rule*, and if you do not obſerve

serve it, you are by your own sentence a *Shuffler*.

It is observable that this Long-winded Rambler hath spent above 20 pages (viz. from p. 48, to p. 71.) in *Little Queries*, *Evasions*, *Shiftings*, Wranglings about words, and yet with pretences of great *Seriousness*. But especially he is for his *Queries*, he is every where *Asking*, he hath *more and more Questions* to put, which verifies a good *Antient Saying* which we have concerning such a *Foolish* Querist as he hath shew'd himself to be. This strange Impertinent humour abounds so excessively in him that one would be curious to enquire what is the source of it, whence it is that throughout all these Papers he is ever starting of idle trifling *Questions*. I can resolve it into nothing but this, that one whose Converse hath been always with *Children* must needs assimilate and ape them, for (as he observes himself, *Educat.* p. 220) they are mightily given to this way of *asking of Questions*: and yet this *Pedantick Tutour* justifies this childish folly in himself of acting thus, p. 54, to p. 60.

Well seeing he is such an Intemperate and Lavish *Asker*, I hope he will not deny me the liberty of asking him only three or four *Questions*: and I conceive I have as much Authority to demand an *Answer* as he.

I. Why doth he pretend sometimes to assert more Articles then one, whereas at other times he peremptorily contends but for One, which he calls the *Sole Article* and the *Only Article*? In two or three other

places he talks of collecting *several Articles*, but how is that consistent with *One*? Concerning that Account of Faith which he offers to the world he thus speaks p. 232. *No one Article which the Apostles proposed as necessary to be receiv'd by unbelievers to make them Christians, is ommitted in it.* When he saith, *no one Article is omitted*, it is implied that there are more Articles then one. If there be *More*, I demand of him to set down just how many they are, seeing he demands the like of me. But with all let him tell the world whether he talks thus as one that is Crazed, and knows not whether *One* and *Many* Articles be the same, or whether his speaking thus be a Preparative to his Recanting his former Doctrine. Here are several Lesser Questions in the Great one that I propounded: let us have his Answer to them all.

II. What is the Reason that he hath not all this while undertaken to disprove that *Plurality* of Fundamental Arrticles which I asserted? Why neither in his *First* nor *Second Vindication* hath he dared to shew that those Articles are not to be believ'd in order to the denominating a man a True Christian, and a Member of Christ? If he could have done it, no body can doubt but that he would, and that with mickle Confidence, for no one will suspect that it is the want of that that hinders him from such an enterprize. This Judicious Player at *Dibstones* finds fault with my Collection of Fundamentals, and yet meddles with *no particular one* of them: only is so senseless and ridiculous as to deny them to be Fundamental Do-

Doctrines of Christianity, and such as are necessarily to be received by every one that lays claim to Christianity. I demand a Reason of this, I require a particular and full Account why every one of those Articles is not to be receiv'd as Fundamental. I shall insist upon it till he either assigns some Reason, or confesses he cannot.

III. How can he expect that I should comply with *his* demands, which are very numerous, and particularly with that of assigning a Set Collection of Fundamentals, when he hath told me already that he is resolved (like a *Well bred man* and a *Good Christian of one Article*) to slight whatever I shall offer to him? If I should propound such doctrines as I verily believe to be Fundamentals, he before hand asks *why he should take them from me rather then from an Anabaptist?* p. 52. And in the same place he saith *he hath as much reason to believe an Anabaptist or Quaker, &c. as me.* Which is as much as to tell me in expres terms that he hath taken up a resolution to attend to no Articles of Faith that I shall propound. Where were the Thoughts of our *Pilgrim-Tutour* when his unwary tongue dropt such words as these? Even when he is soliciting me, yea challenging me to give him *a List of Articles*, he proclaims to the world that he will not accept of any of them: he declares that he would sooner take a Set of Articles, and Fundamentals from a *Socinian* or a *Papist* (for he particularly names them both on this very occasion, than from me, p. 52. And, Sir, we will believe you without swearing.

IV. An other Question I shall put to you, and require an Answer to it. Seeing you have taken part with the Follower of *Socinus*, and have adopted several of their Notions and Tenents, and interpret some Scriptures which relate to the *Trinity* in the same way that they do, and thereby have given occasion to be thought one of the Party, and yet you pretend to disown all acquaintance with them p. 222, 223. seeing you appear thus with a double face, and amuse the world with these disguises, I require of you to return an Answer to this Query, and the several parts of it, Whether you verily believe that *Jesus* is so the *Son of God* that he is really *God*, and that in the Unity of the Divine Essence there is a Trinity of Distinct Persons or Subsistencies, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and that these Three are One God, as the Scriptures plainly and expresly declares. Seeing you are so brisk in *your demands*, I expect a positive *Answer* to *mine*, and *hereby shall we know whether you are a True Man*, or a *Spie*. When I see you have performed this work, I will still find you more employment.

I had proved (*Socinianism Unmask'd* chap. 2.) that his Opinion of *One Article* was founded, among other things, upon this Notion, that all things in Christianity must be so plain that they may be easily comprehended, and that there may be nothing difficult to mens understandings. This I made clear from the tenour and coherence of his words, from his way of reasoning, from the scope of his book, and

and from the plain sense of his expressions. But our *Vindicator* cannot bear this, and therefore puts himself into a posture of shifting and evading whatever was brought against him, and by all imaginable arts he labours to stifle my Reasonings and Arguings on that Point. One of his knacks is to frame a *Dialogue* between me and him, p. 34, 35, 36. and he is so silly in the contriving of it that it baffles him instead of favouring his Cause. Fearing that the *Dialogue* would not do the feat, he appears in the shape of a *Syllogizer* p. 39. though the Inconsiderate Man had derided *Logick* and *Syllogism*, because they are *University-Learning*. The next he falls into the old trade of *Questions*, *Where?* and *When?* and after this is done he begins his *Dialogue* again. This is one of the Distracted Scenes of his *Vindication*, and the Reader may thence form an *idea* of the Whole Work, and see with amazement what little Knacks and Conceits he applies himself to, that he may juggle men out of the Truth. He hath so accustom'd himself to shewing of Tricks among his Young Frie whom he hath had the Tutorage of, that we must never expect any other of him, whatever Subject he handles.

P. 93, 94. he will not admit of any *Mysteries* in Christianity, and therefore opposes what I had asserted, *viz.* that *there are some Doctrines in the Gospel which are not plain and clear, and yet are of necessity to be believ'd.* If he had been Master of any Sincerity, he would have observ'd how I explain'd my self, and shew'd that all the Doctrines and Articles of

the Chriſtian Religion are not alike: ſome of them are in themſelves Evident and Illuſtrious, others becauſe of the Tranſcendency of their Matter are Obſcure and Myſterious, and not level to our humane underſtandings, as the doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*, Chriſt's *Incarnation*, &c. but yet are believ'd with a firm and unſhaken Faith. This is ſo Rational that none but the hood wink'd *Masker* would have excepted againſt it. And he doth it after a very poor rate: He nibbles at the diſtinction I make between the *Certainty* or *Reality* of ſome Evangelical Doctrines, and *the exact manner of the things themſelves* contain'd in thoſe Doctrines: But he finds it pricks his chaps, and ſo he gives it over.

However, like the Gentlemen of *Racovia*, he cannot endure to hear of *Myſteries* in Chriſtianity, and therefore here he takes occaſion to expreſs his great diſlike of thoſe who aſſert that in the Chriſtian Religion there are *Myſteries* properly ſo called, *i. e.* ſuch Truths and Articles, that as to the Manner of the things contained in them are not Intelligible, but exceed humane Reaſon, and cannot poſſibly be fathom'd by it. The denying of this is one of his laſt Artifices and Contrivances, for if we briefly recount the *Methods* of this New Projector, we ſhall find them to be in this order; firſt he preſented the world with odd Conceits of the *Idea's of things*, thereby to undermine the Principles of Truth, and to diſcompoſe the receiv'd Notions in Philoſophy and Divinity, as a very * Reverend and Learn-

* B. of *Worceſter* in his Vind. of the Trinity, ch. 10.

Learned Writer (though one of the chiefeſt and moſt Eminent of the *Pulpit Orators*) hath lately proved againſt him. Then, that his Sentiments might prevail, he preſcribes a new way of *Bringing up of Youth*, and ſeaſoning them betimes in ſome *Private Nurſeries* with ſuch Principles as he and his Aſſociates ſhall dictate; and accordingly all *Publick Schools* and *Univerſities*, and their Studies are cried down by him. Next, there comes forth *a New Plat-form of Religion*, all the Fundamental Articles and Doctrines of Chriſtianity are diſcarded by him, excepting *One* bare ſingle Article, which he thinks fit to retain till he hath a fair opportunity of throwing that off too. Then he further advances, and every where very warmly inveighs againſt *Miniſters* and *Preachers*, partly becauſe of their *Univerſity-Learning*, but chiefly becauſe they oppoſe his groundleſs notion of *One Article*, and aſſert the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity. And laſtly, to compleat his deſign, he ſtrikes in with the *Deiſts* and *Socinians*, and laughs at the *Myſteries* of the Chriſtian Religion, and thereby encourages men to caſt off all *Reveal'd Religion*, the greateſt part of which conſiſts of Profound and Inexplicable *Myſteries*, and ſuch as Humane Reaſon neither found out, nor can comprehend when reveal'd. Theſe are the Ways and Methods he hath applyed himſelf to, in order to the undermining of the Orthodox Faith.

Here I will obſerve to the Reader how profoundly skill'd in *Greek* our *Univerſity Hater* is: He brings in theſe words (though alien

to

to his purpoſe) νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, which, ſaith he, *if we put into Engliſh*, are [the dead ſhall riſe] p. 100. He might have found it rightly tranſlated to his hand in our Engliſh Bible, 1 *Cor.* 15. 15. but we know the Gentleman doth not much meddle with the *Epiſtles* (eſpecially St. *Paul*'s) as we ſhall hear afterwards. He thinks, good man, that ἐγείρονται is a Verb of the *future tenſe*. And here we ſee the reaſon why ſuch as he declaim againſt *Publick Schools*, and againſt *Grammar*. It is no wonder indeed that he deſpairs of *ſetting up for a Critick for fear he ſhould ſet the world of laughing*, p. 67. To this Eminent Skill of his in *Criticiſm and Grammar* we may refer *Cincinnetus*, a new Name for a *Dictator* of *Rome*, p. 356. of his *Education*.

He plays upon the Sacred Names *Jeſus* and *Meſſias* p. 107. and would perſwade the Reader to believe that he ought no more attend to the meaning of the word *Jeſus* and the word *Meſſias* when the Propoſition, *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, is tender'd to him to believe, than to the ſignification of the Name *Saul* or *Arthur*, or any other Name whatſoever. But what is the reaſon then, I ask the *Vindicator* why theſe Names *Jeſus* and *Chriſt* (which latter is the *Greek* for *Meſſias*) are ſo particularly and diſtinctly explained, and deſcanted upon by thoſe Learned and Pious Writers who have commented upon the *Apoſtle's Creed*? We ſee they ſpend a conſiderable time in giving the true and full Import of theſe Denominations. There is mentioned a Man in the ſame Creed, under whom our Saviour ſuffered, but

but we do not find that his double *Name* is ſearched into and ſifted by Expoſitors as thoſe Bleſſed Names *Jeſus* and *Meſſias* are. And the reaſon is plain, becauſe Chriſtian men are concerned to know the true meaning and Senſe of *theſe Titles*, or elſe they can't know who it was that was *born*, *ſuffered*, and *died* for them. In the very *Names* themſelves there is included the Nature of this Divine and Extraordinary Perſon, and therefore it was fit that they ſhould not be ignorant of this. But it is not ſo with other Names, they need not any ſuch Explaining and Opening: as for example *Pontius Pilate* and *John Lock* are well known to be ſuch Perſons, though the Extraction of the *Names* be not explained. I hope our Captious and Ludicrous *Vindicator* will conſider this, and not ridiculouſly and impiouſly undervalue and debaſe the Names of the *Son of God*, and compare them with thoſe of *King Saul* and *Prince Arthur*, and tell us (as he doth afterwards *p.* 108.) that this Propoſition *Jeſus is the Meſſias* needs no more Explication than this, *Cyrus was King of Perſia*. And as to what he ſubjoyns *p.* 109, 110. that I own the Eaſineſs of the foreſaid Propoſition, the *Masker*'s Underſtanding is clouded, or elſe he would not have quoted theſe Words in *p.* 74. of my *Socinianiſm unmask'd* to the purpoſe he doth, for any one may ſee that I intended them to be but a General Deſcription or Character of the *Meſſias*; and the Occaſion of that Lax Character of him is diſcernible in that place to any one but our Muffled *Vindicator*.

He

He would ſhew himſelf a *Critick* p. 112. *&c.* in deſcanting upon the word *Integral* and *Eſſential*, which I made uſe of in a general meaning for whatever appertain'd to the *Eſſence* and *integrity* of a Chriſtian: which ſhews that our Tutour was Over-nice, that his Exceptions are mean and low, and that he is but Practitioner in *Water-gruel.*

P. 117. he tells the Reader that all that part of my Diſcourſe in *Socinianiſm Unmask'd* which reaches from p. 28 to 35. *is nothing but Pulpit-Oratory.* If the Reader will be pleaſed to conſult that part of the Chapter, he may ſatisfy himſelf that there is Ignorance as well as Malice in this Imputation: for I there ſhew that he treads in the ſteps of thoſe of the *Racovian* way who caſt off ſeveral Articles of Chriſtian Faith becauſe they are in part Dark and Myſterious: I ſhew that this was the practiſe of *Grellius*, and is follow'd by the *Engliſh Socinians* at this day: I particularly aſſert the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, and ſhew in what ſenſe it may be ſaid not to be *Difficult*: I prove that it contains in it *no Contradiction*: and as to the One Article ſo talk'd of by him, I make it evident that it is not more Intelligible than any of the Articles which I propounded as Fundamental. Theſe are the Contents of that Part of my Treatiſe, and I appeal to the Reader whether this be the *Pulpit-Oratory.* That the Creature ſhould give it this Name, is the higheſt piece of Nonſenſe, and the plaineſt proof of Stupidity that he could have divulg'd to the world: unleſs: you will ſay, it was only to have a

fling

ſling at the *Pulpit* (which he often mentions with Contempt and Reproach) and then it is *Prophane Spite.*

When I objected to him *his Contempt of the Epiſtolary Writings of the Apoſtles*, which I evinc'd from his *paſſing them by* and wholly neglecting to gather any Articles of Faith out of them, he replies, in way of Recrimination, that I *have paſs'd by ſeveral Chapters and Verſes in my Collection of Articles*, and thence infers my *Contempt* of them, p. 122. It is to be hoped there are but few men in the world whoſe brains are thus diſorder'd. Could any one but this ſhallow *Vindicator* think that I ſhould collect the Fundamental Articles of Chriſtanity out of all the Chapters and Verſes of the New Teſtament? Or, if I did not ſo, and mentioned not ſome of them, that this was any Argument of my deſpiſing thoſe Writings? Could any but this poor Dandler of Infants imagine that there is a parity between theſe two, *viz.* my collecting of the Fundamental Articles out of the *Goſpels*, *Acts*, and *Epiſtles*, and his preſenting of us with one Article only out of the *Evangeliſts* and *Acts*, without ſo much as taking notice of the *Apoſtolical Epiſtles*? Could any but this Weak Arguer infer from my not mentionig every chapter and verſe in the New Teſtament that this is the ſame with omitting all the *Epiſtles*? Could any one that hath not the like Hardened Front with himſelf publiſh to the world that this is a ſign of my *Contemning* the Scriptures? and then upon this occaſion he hath the vanity to vent a ſilly paultry Quibble upon *paſſing by*, which none but

but such an abhor'd *Pedant* would stain his paper with.

Then, as if he had discarded all Truth, and seared his Conscience with a hot iron, he hath the face to utter such words as these *viz*, that *I, though a Minister of the Gospel, cannot bear the Texts of Scripture which he hath produced, nor his quotations out of the four Evangelists*, p. 152. whereas any one that pursues what I have writt may see that I only objected against his Quotations as not being a Compleat Collection, and because in several places he distorted the Evangelists words. Yet according to his never-failing art of Falsifying he represents me as one that vilifies the Four Evangelists. Such another daring Falshood is that, that *I think the Gospel, the Good News of Salvation, tedious from the mouth of our Saviour and his Apostles*, p. 126. For which apparent forgery I claim the forfeiture of his Ears, if he hath not (as he hath deserv'd) lost them before. And from this you may gather what Sincerity there is in his objecting to me that *I make bold with Truth*, and that what I say *is utterly false* p. 403. you must not credit one word of it, for once a Forger, and always so. This is his master piece of Art to cheat and abuse the world with downright Falsities, and to betray Christanity, and yet whilst he is doing this to accuse others of being False.

He *grants* p. 127. what I had urged about *the Four Gospels being writ to and for Believers, as well as Unbelievers*, and yet immediately after he revokes his Grant, and sophistically shifts it off,

off, ſo that no man alive knows where to have the Gentleman.

But it is worth our remarking that it hath pleaſed God to leave this Man to his own infatuations, and to ſuffer him to produce and inſiſt upon a portion of Scripture which is an abſolute Confutation of what he brings it for. p. 125. He quotes a great part of the fifth chapter to the *Hebrews* to prove that the Neceſſary Articles and Principles of Faith are not to be gather'd out of the *Epiſtles*, particularly he makes uſe of thoſe words, *You have need that one teach you again which be the firſt Principles of the Oracles of God.* v. 12. And the Apoſtle in chap. 6. v. 1. particularly ſets down theſe *Principles of the doctrine of Chriſt*, (as he alſo ſtiles them.) Who but this Obſtinate and Senſeleſs *Vindicator* would hence infer (as he ſtrenuouſly doth) that the Apoſtolical *Epiſtles*, and this eſpecially, were not written to teach men the Fundamental Principles of Chriſtianity? We have ſeen what a Talent he hath of *Grammar* and *Criticiſm*; now behold the mans Improvements in *Logick*? If you pleaſe wee'l reduce what he ſaith into a *Syllogiſm*, becauſe this profound Logitian hath ſet us a Pattern before, and he will take it ill if we don't follow him.

"If it be plainly expreſs'd in the Epiſtle to "the *Hebrews* that *they have need to be taught* "*again the Firſt Principles of the Oracles of God*, "*and of the doctrine of Chriſt*, and accordingly "the Apoſtle diſtinctly tells them what ſome "of theſe Principles are, then neither this E-"piſtle nor any other Epiſtles of the Apoſtles

"diſtinctly

" distinctly shew what were those doctrines, " which were absolutely necessary to make " men Christians (I use the Logitian's own " words):

" But it is plainly expressed in the Epistle " to the *Hebrews* that *they have need to be* " *taught again the first Principles of the Ora-* " *cles of God, and of the doctrine of Christ*, and " accordingly the Apostle distinctly tells them " what some of those Principles are:

" *Ergo*, neither this Epistle nor any other " Epistles of the Apostles distinctly shew what " were those doctrines which were absolute- " ly necessary to make a Man a Christian.

Or more briefly he argues thus, " This and " other Epistles tell us what are the Necessary " Principles of Christianity; Ergo, they do " not tell us.

You have a taste of his *Logical* Faculty, and I doubt not but you likewise have been drawing a *Conclusion* from the Premises, *viz.* that such Wild Reasonings argue a flaw in his Skull that uses them. Is this the *Thoughtful* man? A Creature that goes on all four, if it could speak, would talk much better Sense. Here is such a Heap of Contradictions, and such Impiety in citing the Holy Text to patronize them, that I question not but the Judicious Reader will hence form such thoughts of this Gentleman as his great merits require.

But surely in his next quotations out of an *Epistle* (though it be a part of Scripture which he so much dreads) he will take care to speak tolerable sense, and not to abuse the Sacred Writ in this palpable manner. Let us

see

see then how it is with him in his Citation out of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. In order to prove his former wild Conceit, that the *Epistles* of the Apostles are not to be consulted for Fundamentals of Christianity, he alledges chap. 3. v. 2. *I have fed you with milk, and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it: neither yet are ye able.* The plain meaning of which words without doubt is this, that the Apostle had hitherto taught them, and continued still to teach them the Necessary and Indispensable Doctrines of Christianity, such as were as needful for them as *Milk* for babes. Because they were not able to bear any heavy Superstructure, he made it his chief business to *lay the Foundation*, and this *Foundation* is *Jesus Christ*, *v.*10,11. The plain way of Salvation by this JESUS the Son of God, the Plain and Eaty Articles of the Christian Faith (all of them Plain as to the Truth and Certainty of them, though some of them not Plain as to the manner of the things comprehended in those Articles) these plain and simple Truths (which are as Pure and Unsophisticated as *Milk*, and therefore are so termed here) are those Doctrines which the Apostle taught the *Corinthians*. And now then let us see how this Man of Logick argues from the Apostle's words; and to give you the better light into his excellent way of Arguing, we will present it in Mode and Figure, for Mr. *Chillingworth*, saith he, bid his Adversary *write nothing but Syllogisms*, p. 228. and besides we find that Good Mr. *Bold* is for *Syllogisms*, p. 4. of his *Reply*: So

that upon these Weighty Authorities we must betake our selves to this way of Disputing. Thus then he argues,

"If the Apostle *fed the Corinthians with* "*milk*, i. e. taught them the Plain and Ne- "cessary Articles of Christianity, and deli- "vered such in his *Epistles* to them, then we "are not to think that any Fundamental and "Necessary Articles of the Christian Religi- "on, such as are to be received to make a "man a Christian, are to be found in this or "any other of the Epistles:

"But the Apostle *fed the Corinthians with* "*milk*, i. e. taught them the Plain and Ne- "cessary Articles of Christianity, and deli- "vered such in his Epistles to them:

"*Ergo*, we are not to think that any Fun- "damental and Necessary Articles of the Chri- "stian Religion, such as are to be received to "make a man a Christian, are to be found in "this, or any other of the Epistles.

Risum teneatis? If the *Vindicator* can clear this from Nonsense, I promise him that the Reader and I will leave off laughing at him for his cashiering of *Burgersdicius*. But in the mean time we see the reason why this *Itinerant Innovator* is so zealous against **Logick**, and *University-Learning*. He trembles at the thoughts of Strict Sense and Argument, because these make against him: Yea, he makes the Blessed Apostle contradict himself, meerly to contradict me.

And I would further remark, that immediately after he had quoted those foresaid words of the Apostle, he adds, THEREFORE *very little*

little is said in this Epistle for explaining any part of the Great Mystery of Salvation (and yet before he was against all *Mysteries* in Christianity) *contain'd in the Gospel*, p. 131. And presently after, *The same holds in all the other Epistles, and* THEREFORE *the Epistles seem'd not to me to be the propereſt part of Scripture* (he said before they were not at all *proper*) *to give us the Foundation*, p. 132. He complains of a *therefore* of mine, where there is no cause at all for it, p. 111. but here is such a pair of *Therefores* as never was heard of in any Age, and be sure never will be, unless it be in his Writings. It was St. *Paul*'s way to instruct the *Corinthians* in the plain Principles of Christianity, he took care to settle them in the Foundation, seeing they were not fit at that time for any considerable Superstructure, and *therefore* (saith our *Vindicator*) we must not expect to meet with any such Principles in this Epstle, or in any others. There are several people in that Great Brick House he wots of at the lower end of *Moorfields*, that never bid for that place by talking so ravingly. Whether the *Childrens* Crying and Bawling, or the *Mothers Unkindnesses* to him have put him into these disorders, I shall not determine, but the poor Animal is certainly much shatter'd, and 'tis to be fear'd belongs to the Hospital of the *Incurable*.

Then he proceeds, p. 138, 139. to mention my taking notice of his feigned ground of *Writing the Epistles*, viz. because *the Fundamental Articles are mix'd here with other Truths*. But having nothing to rejoyn, he falls to *Railing*, a fault which he imputes to me, but is peculiar to himself.

And as for what I ſaid of *Mixture*, that thoſe things which are promiſcuouſly put together are capable of being *diſtinguiſh'd* (which he boggles at) there is an Example of it in one he knows very well; a *Committee man* and a *Vindicator* are mix'd together, but there is a poſſibility of *diſtinguiſhing*, yea of ſeparating the former from the latter, the Honorable from the Vile; though 'tis true ſome things are ſo *mix'd* in ſome perſons that they will never admit of a ſeparation, as a *Chamber-Quack* and an *Abhorrer of Univerſities*; or thus, an *Innovator* and a *Creed-Hater*. There is no parting of theſe. In the ſame place he thinks it Witty to reflect twice on my *Degree* in the Univerſity, as if B. D. were as Contemptible as A B C, which is his own Character.

He jogs on ſtill p. 140, 141, &c. ſometimes coyning matter, and faſtning it upon me, ſometimes impertinently asking of *Queſtions*, and requiring *Anſwers*, and every where falling into ridiculous Impertinencies, and weak reaſonings: And what elſe could be expected from a Man that had all his days been us'd to the Tattle of Brats and Nurſlings, and hath thereby perfectly learn'd all their humors, eſpecially (as I obſerv'd before) their impertinent Queries, and troubleſome Babblings? Thus our Old *Tutour* is twice a Child, though he doats ſo extremely that he can't ſee it, but verily perſwades himſelf that all he hath writ againſt me is Strong and Nervous, and, like what he dictates to his *Young Maſters*, muſt not be examin'd and cenſured.

Only

Only here it is to be noted, that what he saith p. 145. concerning *Popular Haranguing*, is a saucy Reflection on the Chiefest and most Eminent of the *Clergy of our Church*, whose constant employment hath been that which he contemptuously calls *Popular Haranguing*, and in other places *Pulpit-Oratory*, i. e. Preaching. Such is his Spleen against this Evangelical Institution, and the Ministers of it, though he makes a shew of being a *Christian*. But he that will bespatter the Universities, and Academick Learning, and expunge the Chiefest Articles of Religion out of the Bible, will not stop at any thing.

But our *Penny-Post* is upon the hoof still, p. 146, 147, &c. and his Quill is as Itinerant as himself, and like its Owner, fixes no where, hath no Habitation. Sometimes he quotes what I have said, and misinterprets it, at other times, to fill up his book, and to make it bulky, he gives you large shivers out of his own Writings, for he thinks none are so good as they, and that's the reason he never quotes an Author, unless it be to disparage him. He trifles to a prodigy, and according to his constant Method, he never fails at the close of a Paragraph to wind up all with *Railing*, his Mother-tongue.

But wondrous it is to see what work he makes p. 156. where the Reader will be puzzel'd to tell whether his Falshood or his Weakness be greater: He complains that I call him a *Betrayer of Christianity and a Contemner of the Epistles, because he did not out of them name* [*Satisfaction:*] Whereas the Reader will

will find, if he thinks fit to consult my *Socinianism Unmask'd*, that I treat of his *Contempt of the Epistles* in one Chapter, and of his refusing to use the word *Satisfaction* in an other. And I mention his *not naming of Christ's Satisfying for us* on no other account but this, that it argues he is a favourer of *Socinianism*, because when he professedly and designedly enumerates the *Advantages* of our Saviour's Coming, he speaks not of his *making Satisfaction* for us. This is the true and plain account of the matter, whence it is obvious to take notice of his willful violation of Truth and Sincerity. He jumps from the Third Chapter of my Book to the Seventh to form a Falshood against me. He most untruly and perversly represents the thing he speaks of, and there is no shadow of Verity in what he saith: So that the Reader is sufficiently caution'd against depending upon his word for the future; and he must always suppose him to be an arrant *Masker*.

But he is as Silly as he is False, for, in the same place, to excuse himself as to his not mentioning of *Satisfaction*, he saith, *there is not any such word in any one of the Epistles, or other Books of the New Testament in his Bible as Satisfying, or Satisfaction made by our Saviour, and so he could not put it into his Christianity as delivered in the Scripture.* Very sound and solid! It being such a Noble Strain of Logick and Reason, we will form it into a *Syllogism*, and leave it as Mr. *Lock*'s Memorial to posterity. It is briefly thus:

"If

" If there be no such word as *Satisfaction* " in any of the books of the New Testament, " it cannot be put into *Christianity* as deliver- " ed in the Scripture.

" But there is no such word as *Satisfaction* " in any of the Books of the New Testament.

" *Ergo*, it can't be put into *Christianity* as " delivered in the Scripture.

Get thee gone, for a Cunning Disputant: thou hast not thy fellow, I verily believe, within the Compass of the four Seas. By the same way of Arguing I will prove that the doctrine of the *Trinity* is no part of Christianity as delivered in the Scripture. And so you may, saith the *Vindicator*, for I hold there is no such thing as the *Trinity* in Scripture.

But I will try again, by the same Argument I will prove that the *Divine Decrees*, and the *Attributes* of God, and his *Providence* are no Part of *Christianity*, because these words [*Decrees*, *Attributes*, *Providence*] (as it is understood of God) are not in Scripture. Nor do the *Sacraments* belong to *Christianity*, because that word occurs no where in the Sacred Writings, as *Barclay* (Apol. p. 292.) profoundly argues. Nay, The word *Christianity* is not to be found in Scripture, why then doth this man talk of *Christianity as delivered in the Scripture?* You see by this what strange and inconsistent things he obtrudes upon the Reader. He will not allow of *Satisfaction* because the word is not mention'd in the Bible: Is there any reason then to own such a thing as *Christianity*, seeing the word is not found there? But he will say, the Thing is. And

the ſame I ſay of *Satisfaction*; and ſo the *Vindicator* ſhews himſelf to be a ſorry contemptible Wrangler, and lets the World know that he hath dealt ſo much with *Children*, that he's of that number himſelf.

But afterwards p 157. he pretends to own the *Thing*, and to ſay it may be collected out of his *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*. Yet ſtill the *Stubborn* and *Stomachful* Man (which diſpoſition he obſerves reigns much in Children Educat. p. 121, 122.) will not buckle to the *Word*. Surely this ſame word *ſatisfying* hath been ſome way or other very miſchievous to him, that he ſo ſtarts back at the naming of it. But to come cloſe to the buſineſs, I appeal to any Impartial Man whether it can in any probability be believ'd that a perſon own ſuch or ſuch a *Truth* or *Doctrine* of the Goſpel, and yet will not expreſs it by that *Word* or *Name* which all the Profeſſors of the Orthodox Faith have agreed to call it by. This is the Caſe of the *Vindicator*, he pretends to allow of the *Satisfaction* of Chriſt, and yet he abſolutely refuſes to uſe the Word. But till he can give us any Reaſon for this refuſal, we ſhall believe that the true Cauſe why he will not admit of the Word is, becauſe he diſbelieves the Thing it ſelf.

P. 159 he would be faſtning two Properties of a *Jeſuite* (as he ſaith) upon me; but every one ſaith they are his Own, and therefore I will not injure him by laying claim to them. And this I'll tell him moreover, that he hath an Other Property of one of that Order, which he hath not named, and that is *Trudg-*

Trudging up and down, and *having no Home*. And if a man can be of *Loiola*'s Order and a *Mendicant* too, then I'm sure he may put in for both.

What he jabbers p. 163, 164. about *Satisfaction* not being named at the Admission of those of Riper Years to Baptism, he might have seen answer'd, if he had had two eyes, in my *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 47.

P. 168. he comes to make little Whimsical Remarks on what I had said of the *Apostles Creed*, he raises Trifling Objections; he sets up a Phantom, a mere Shadow, and then encounters it; he is *wanton* and freakish, and in brief, the Kitling plays with his own Tail.

He insists upon the terms *Abstract* and *Abridgment*, p. 173, 174. and spends a great many vain words about them, but can't for his heart disprove what I asserted, *viz.* that the foresaid *Creed* is an *Abstract* or *Abridgment* of the Christian Faith, which is more fully expres's'd in the Holy Scriptures, not only in the *Gospel*, but in the *Epistles*, which our *Vindicator* cannot endure to hear of. At last I am to be the *Jesuite* again, and he is to take Mr. *Chillingworth*'s place, and so the *Protestant* is to confute the *Papist*, and there's an end of that silly Fantastick Fiction of our *Masker*, not worthy of one of the poor raw Boys that he hath drag'd up in his time.

Further, it is to be noted that after he had banded as fiercely as he could against my notion of *Abridgment*, and, to thwart me, had produced *Chillingworth*'s sense of the word, he confesses that he is ignorant *whether what* Chillingworth

lingworth *had given, be the nature of an Abridgment, or no.* p. 177. Which shews how fickle and restive he is, and that he builds upon precarious hypotheses, and is not careful whether there be any Ground for what he saith. This would make one doubt whether this Writer be in his right mind or no. Hath not former *Thoughtfulness* disorder'd his Brain, that he thus talks?

P. 177. he would seem to pay some honour to the *Primitive Church* and *the Church of* England (though no man believes it, no not himself) and to vindicate their practise in admitting persons to Baptism upon the Faith contain'd in the *Apostles Creed*, as if no more were to be believ'd by them than what is in *express terms* in that Form of Confession. But the Catechism of our Church may satisfy him that more is comprehended in that Form of Faith than is *expresly* there mention'd, else it would not have been said that *we are chiefly to learn, in these Articles of our Belief, to believe in God the Father, in God the Son, and in God the Holy Ghost.* He may look long enough into the Creed, and never find there these words, *God the Son*, and *God the Holy Ghost*; but Our Church lets us know that these terms are really contain'd in that Profession of Faith. Whence it follows that when persons are baptized into the Faith of the Apostles Creed, they are baptized into the Faith of the *Trinity*, and consequently into more than is in *express words* mention'd in this Symbol of our Faith. Which is the thing that this Quarrelsome Animal objects against, but is not able after all his

flut-

fluttering to effect any thing. Besides, it is evident that our Church thinks not this *Creed* to be absolutely Perfect and Compleat, because she adds other Creeds to it, as the *Nicene* and *Athanasian*. Which it is probable she would not have done if every thing to be believ'd were in express, direct, and full words set down in the other Form of Belief. And again, as to what he saith of the *Primitive Practise* of admitting persons to Baptism upon the bare confession of the Apostles Creed, he betrays his Ignorance, having not learnt from several Eminent Writers that this Creed is not exactly the same that it was in the First Ages of Christianity, but that some Articles have been added to it. But the heedless *Masker* attends to none of these things, but goes on Chattering, and loves to hear his Clack move. But you must pardon him, for he that is used to the Conversation of Nurses, and the whole *Posse* of the Chatting Crew, can't be thought to moderate his Intemperate Organ.

P. 183, 184. he heaves very hard to take off a *Blunder* that had been justly imputed to him, but he runs into a greater and more ridiculous one, and salves it by *Supposition*, for he would have it *supposed* (and that is a great word with him, you must note, in his Writings) that the Compilers of the Creed who lived in several Centuries, yet *lived in one age or time*. This is precious stuff, you will say. Though some of the Compilers of the Creed lived at some years distance from one an other, yet by a *Supposition* they are Contemporary, and live together. Yes, it must be

be ſo by all means, he peremptorily vouches that *the ſuppoſition of their living together is eaſy, at what diſtance ſo ever they lived, and how many ſo ever there were of them.* p. 185. This is as if he ſhould *ſuppoſe* that all the *Pedantick Tutors* that lived in King *Richard* the Second's, and King *Henry* the Eight's reigns ſhould live at the ſame time with our *Vindicator* who is of the ſame race and kind. One would not think that a man that talks ſo much againſt *Poetry* as he doth, ſhould have ſuch a fanſiful knack of *Fiction.* The ſenſe of this *Blunder* hath ſomewhat dampt him, and for ſome pages together he is down in the mouth, and only ſneakingly deſires me to *ſhew* him this, and *ſhew* him that, *i.e.* to ſhew him his Folly: which I need not do, he hath ſufficiently done it himſelf.

Then p. 190, 191, 192, 193, *&c.* he is at his old work of *Repetition*, and quoting himſelf (though he could not quote a worſe Author) and filling up whole pages with what he had ſaid in his *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtanity*, and in his former *Vindication.* And truly this is his employment every where, ſo that a man may modeſtly compute that there are three parts of his book ſpent in Reiterating the ſame things, and in the very ſame words. He that is ſo much againſt *Themes* will not permit himſelf to *vary the Phraſe*, but brings over his old matter again in the very ſame individual terms that he uſed before, which renders his Farce very ridiculous and irkſom. But beſides the impudent Vanity of the thing, there is a great deal of Knavery and Diſhoneſty in it, which he ought to anſwer for. None

but

but he that hath counterfeited his Name would impose upon the world by offering them a false number of Pages, to heighten the Price of them. The Reader is cheated into a book of above thirty sheets, when, if you pare off his Repetitions, there remain not above eight or nine. Here is a gross piece of Injustice, to make the Buyer pay five shillings for a Twelve penny Cut. This is a New way of Writing, to insert one book into an other *verbatim*, and so to chouse the unwary Chapman. Nay, it might be further observed that whatever he hath *added* in this last Pamphlet is run over *again* in some places of it, as if he studied to make it more Ridiculous then it seem'd to be at the first reading. But it appears it was his business to heap up a Multitude of words, and to eeke out his poor lank matter: for a Book was to come out against what I had writ, and there was a necessity of Stuffing it and Swelling it, and to say Much where Nothing could be said to the Purpose.

In his next pages 202, *&c.* he is stark mad at me for intimating that he and his Allies are *Under-hand Factors for Rome*. See how it pleases the Divine Disposer of all things that by occasion of a small Hint a man shall discover to the world his Inward Consciousness, and together with that his Propensions and Designs which he with all the art imaginable labour'd to *mask* and conceal! When I but mention'd the Tendency of the Party to *Rome*, he, as a Concern'd and Guilty Criminal, starts up, and shews himself gall'd and pinch'd, he flies about and grows furious and outragious.

What

What! saith he, doth this Orthodox Railer tell us that we are *Factors* for *Rome*, and truck for *Popery*? What! doth he think that because I hate *Universities*, I am in love with the *Whore of Babylon*? How can I be of the *Roman* Church that am of none? But this is easily answer'd by the known Maxim, *One of no Religion will soon be of any*. Scepticism makes way for Popery. The doctrine which the *Author* and *Vindicator of the Reasonableness of Christianity* hath spread abroad, is contrived on purpose to bring men off from the Received Articles of Christianity, and to prepare them to be Scepticks and Infidels. I hope to give the Reader satisfaction about this and in a few words to convince the Intelligent and Serious Considerer that it is the design of this Writer to *unsettle Religion*, to introduce *Indifferency* and *Neutrality* into Christianity, to place all Opinions on a level, to represent all Doctrines to be alike, that there may be no contending for any Articles of Faith, that those which were look'd upon by the Primitive Church and by Our Own as Fundamental Doctrins of Christianity may for the future not be thought necessary to be known and believ'd in order to making men True Christians, He perswades men that *One Article* will do their business, and that those who pass for *Orthodox Protestants* confound people with *bundels* of doctrines, which are useless and unnecessary; that half the Bible, Yea a quarter of it is enough, that One of the *Evangelists* Writings contains all the rest (for which he quotes Mr. *Chillingworth*) and therefore if all the rest

rest were lost, we need not concern our selves about it; as for the *Epistles* of the Apostles, we need not trouble our heads with looking into them, for there is only now and then *dropt* by the bye an Article of Faith.

And then, this Author under the pretence of declaring against *Systems of Divinity* (which is his Common Subject) strikes at all the Received and Celebrated Doctrines of the Christian Church, and represents them as indifferent and precarious. Every where he shews his abhorence of the very word *System* (as if it were as uneasy to him as *Satisfying*) so that it is a singular and extraordinary favour he would quote (as he doth, and that with Respect) Dr. *Cudworths book* that bears the Name of *System*. Now, I am only to take notice of the Ground of his inveighing against *Systems*, which is his design of bringing an *odium* on the Settl'd Truths of Christianity, and to make way for his own Giddy Notions. Accordingly he pronounces concerning those Stable Fundamentals of Christianity that *they were framed and fashioned according to the humors, interests, or designs of the Heads of Parties, as if they were things depending on mens pleasure, and to be suited to their convenience*. These are his words p. 215, 216. and speak his heart; and the *Turkish Spye* doth not express *his mind more fully*. Thus he disposes his Readers to be of no Church, of no Religion. Or at least he would perswade them that one way of Religion is as good as an other: which is the prevailing doctrine of these days. Therefore Mr. *Bold*

(one

(one whom I shall afterwards account with) was much mistaken when he said, *he never hardly appear'd on a fashionable subject*, Rep.p.3. for this Opinion, and that *One religion is as good as another*, is the *Modish* doctrine every where. This Country Gentleman is in the *Fashion*, and doth not know it. (And thence you may judge of the Truth of what Mr. *Lock* saith of him, that *he takes not up his Opinions from Fashion. Pref. to his Vindicat.*)

Now this is a fair step towards *Rome*, for if one Religion be equivalent to an other, and our Salvation is not concerned in the belief of the Necessary Articles of *our Faith*, then we are at liberty to embrace what Form and Model of Articles we please, and those of the Church of *Rome* will perhaps be thought as good as any. There is a strange passage in this Writer, p.217,218. which speaks his favourable opinion of the *Pontifician* way, *I have often wondred*, saith he, *to hear men of several Churches so heartily exclaim against the Implicit Faith of the Church of Rome, when the same Implicit Faith is as much practis'd and required in their own, though not so openly profess'd, and ingeniously own'd there.* First, he lets us know that from that Converse which he hath had with persons of *several Churches*, whether of the Communion of the Church of *England*, or those of the Dissenters, he finds that they are against the Church of *Rome*. Secondly, that though they are against the doctrine of *Implicit Faith* in the Church of *Rome*, yet they like it well enough in their *own*. Thirdly, they not only like it, but *practise* it, yea the very

very *same* Implicit Faith. Fourthly, they not only *practise* but *require* it, they command and enjoyn those of their Communion to believe all they say with an Implicit Faith. But fifthly, they do not this with so good a grace as those of the *Roman Church* do. For those latter are very *open and ingenuous* in their profession and practise of implicit Faith, but the former are not so. *Protestants* have not that Candor and Fairness which are to be seen in *Papists*; they neither so *openly profess*, nor so *ingenuously own* this doctrine, but yet as strictly *practise* it, and *require the practise* of it as they do. I leave it with the Reader to determine from the Premises which of these two, those of the *Roman* or of the *Reform'd* Churches, have the happiness to be most in favour with this Gentleman.

In the known stile of the *Roman* Priests and Writers he declares that *the Scripture serves but like a Nose of Wax*, p 213. And as the Heads of the Church of *Rome* deny the *Bible* to the Common people, so he is advancing towards this apace, for he lops off three of the *Evangelists*, (for one he saith will suffice) and all the *Epistles*. And further to shew his good will to the *Roman Catholicks*, and to their Beloved Notion of *Transubstantiation* he tells us p. 408, 409. that *if a man understands those words of our Saviour's Institution* [*This is my body*] *and* [*This is my blood*] *in a Literal sense, he must believe the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper are changed really into his Body and Blood, though he knows not how.* And afterwards he saith,, *He is obliged to belive it to be*

true, and to assent to it. And presently afterwards, *To deny assent to this as true, would be to deny our Saviour's Veracity, and consequently his being the Messiah sent from God.* Here he lets us know that his *One* Article is quite renounced if *Transubstantiation* be not admitted. You see what his making of [*Jesus is the Messias*] to be the *Sole* Article of Christian Faith, comes to. But this doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is so grateful to him that he brings it over again, p 413, 414. assuring us that *the Old Gentleman at* Rome, *who hath an Antient Title to Infallibility, may make Transubstantiation a Fundamental Article necessarily to be believ'd, as well as I make the Divinity of Christ and his Satisfaction*, &c. (for these he means by *the Sense of any Disputed Texts of Scripture*, because the Texts concerning these Points are disputable with him) *Fundamental Articles necessarily to be believ'd.* It is brought to this issue it seems, that *Transubstantiation* is as Fundamental an Article of the Christian Faith as any that can be nam'd besides *Jesus's being the Messias.* Thus by the Over-ruling Providence of Heaven this sort of Writers discover the inward bent of their thoughts and inclinations, though they labour to hide them from the world. This Gentleman would be thought to have no kindness for *Rome*, and yet his own words confute him. As I observ'd before that he stoutly *Rails* whilest he is remonstrating against that practice, so here he stiffly patronizes *Popery*, even when he had pretended to shew himself displeas'd at my charging him with it.

And

And I could produce ſeveral other paſſages out of his Writings which makes it appear that our *Preſter John* is inclined to receive the *Roman Miſſionaries*; I could make it evident that he is Indifferent as to the *Reform'd Religion*, and the Doctrines profeſſed by the Owners of it, and that he inſpires mens minds with a diſeſteem of thoſe Articles which the Chriſtian Churches ſince the Reformation have unanimouſly aſſerted and vindicated, and that he repreſents them as Ridiculous. You muſt not, ſaith he, give ear to what the *Preachers* and *Pulpit Orators* of theſe Churches tell you about more Articles than One as neceſſary to be known and believed, in order to making you Chriſtians. If you aſſent to this Single Propoſition, *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, I declare to you that you are, as to matter of Faith, as Good Chriſtians as St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were. When your Pariſh-Prieſts endeavour in their *Popular Harangues* to perſwade you that this is not the ſum Total of the Chriſtian Faith, but that there are other Neceſſary and Fundamental Doctrines which are of the Eſſence of Chriſtianity, you muſt roundly tell them from me, that the *Catalogue of Fundamentals every one alone can make for himſelf: no body can collect or preſcribe it to an other, but this is according as God hath dealt to every one the meaſure of light and faith, and hath open'd each mans underſtanding, that he may underſtand the Scripture.* Theſe are the expreſs words of our *Vindicator*, p. 85. and from them it undeniably follows, that though no body muſt be a *Creed-maker*, yet every

one may be a *Fundamental-maker*. Mr. *Hobbs* was pleaſed to give this power to the *King* only, but this Gentleman is more liberal, and grants it to every Subject: He may make what *Catalogue of Fundamentals* he pleaſes, and put this into it, among the reſt, that the *Pope* is Infallible, and that the Religion of the Church of *Rome* is to be prefer'd to that of the *Reformed*. Fundamentals depend not upon the *Scriptures*, but upon mens *Underſtandings*, and therefore every man according to his apprehenſions may make as many, and as few Fundamental Articles as he thinks fit. What think you now of our *Tutor*, our *Anti-Academian*? Is not this Man of *One Article* diſpoſed to entertain the *Twelve New Articles* of Faith of the *Council of Trent*?

It is impoſſible to conceive how Great Miſchief that perſon may do whoſe Head is ſtuff'd with ſuch Notions as theſe, eſpecially if we conſider he is always *creeping into Houſes*, and inſinuating into *Families*, and wheadling the *Maſters* and *Miſtreſſes*, and infecting the early thoughts of *young Ones* with ſuch Principles. Such a one the Commonwealth is concern'd to have an eye upon, for the ſafety of the Publick. And though all this while I don't ſuppoſe him to be ſet on work upon any conſideration of his extraordinary Skill or Ability, as if I took him either for a Conjurer or a Jeſuite, yet he may be made uſe of as a very fit Tool, as a Convenient Machin, and (as I ſaid before) he may ſerve to be an Under-hand Factor. And if the Creature had not been ſome ſuch thing, it is impoſſible he

ſhould

should startle and stare, and fling about (as the Reader may observe he doth) at the naming of *Popery* and *Rome*. He conceals the resentment as well as he can, but the Observing Reader may plainly discern it. None would have been guilty of this but our Ridiculous *Masker*, who, in imitation of the Changling kind, hides his face, and then thinks no body sees him. But notwithstanding all his Artifices and Disguises, he bewrays himself. As they vulgarly say of the Fiend, that when he appears in Humane Shape, he can never dissemble it so well, but he is some way or other discover'd, there is some mark to discern him by.

A little after, p. 229, 230. he returns to the *One Article* again, and upbraids me for *many*. *I have*, he saith, *a reserve of the Lord knows how many more*, p. 233. which is Irreverently and Prophanely spoken, because he uses the Sacred Name so slightly and vainly. By this we may guess what manner of *Education* his Children and Nurslings have: He that abuses that Holy Name himself will not check this fault in others.

Then in three pages together, 232, 233, 234. he falls into his old Trot of *telling* me, and desiring to *shew*, and let him *know*, &c. Without any shame or remorse he continues to stuff whole pages with Reiterations of his former Writings. Though he was lately not for *telling*, but for *weighing of money*, yet he hath other thoughts with respect to his *Books*, for he reckons *Number* to be *Weight*. Such Writers glory in the number of their Lines,

and think to be Voluminous is to be Argumentative.

Next, p. 238, *&c.* he runs back to Object against the Reaſon which I aſſigned why the believing of *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſias* is ſo frequently mention'd in the New Teſtament: And he buſies himſelf with Wire-drawing every word that I had ſaid, and *ſcores* up all along (as he had done before) what I muſt *ſhew* him, and what I muſt *prove*, and ſets them down in diſtinct *Figures*: And yet after all theſe little devices and pedantick tricks, he hath not rais'd one Objection againſt me that hath any thing more in it than his *Childrens Rattle*. And indeed it muſt needs be ſo, and can't be otherwiſe: when men have taken up falſe deceitful Notions, and then labour to Vindicate them, it is preſently ſeen that their pretences of Arguing are mere Sound, and are nothing but Childiſh and Noiſy Amuſements.

In no leſs than 20 pages afterwards he buſies himſelf in hunting for Objections and Cavils againſt what I had ſaid, and at laſt reſolves to admit but of a ſingle Article as neceſſary to be believ'd in order to the making a man a Chriſtian. But will not that Sermon of St. *Peter* in Acts 2. evidence that there are *more* Fundamental Points than that one, *Jeſus is the Meſſias?* Are not our Saviour's *Paſſion*, *Death*, and *Reſurrection* particularly mention'd in ver. 23, 24 and are they not *Fundamental Articles* of Faith? Can you believe *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſias*, without believing him to have *ſuffer'd, died, and roſe again?* To this it is

an-

answer'd, p. 268. that *these Articles were not proposed by St.* Peter *to the unbelieving Jews as Fundamental ones*, and consequently they are not to be reckon d as Fundamental Articles, for it is certain that the Holy Apostle propo-sed them as they were. I request the Serious and Judicious Reader to take an estimate of Mr. *Lock*'s *Reasonableness of Christianity* from this one thing, *viz.* his denying the Articles of our Saviour's *Suffering*, *Death*, and *Resur-rection* to be Articles of the Foundation, *i. e.* such as are necessarily required to be believ'd, for the constituting a man a Christian. That he denies this is plain, because he tells us that St. *Peter* propounded not these Articles as Fundamental, and because according to him there is but one Fundamental Article. If there be but One, then these are no Fundamen-tal Propositions, unless you will say that three added to one make but one. Which I think he will scarcely assent to, unless his *Arithme-tick* be proportionable to his *Christianity*. Be-sides, in an other place, p 233. he is Positive as to this matter, for his words are these, [*The Death and Resurrection of Christ are recorded by the Spirit of God in Holy Writ, but are no more necessary to be believed to make a man a Christian than any other part of Divine Revelation*] that is, than any Inferiour Truth men-tion'd in the New Testament, as that Christ rid upon an Ass. This he declares to be as requisite to *make a man a Christian* as that Christ died and rose again.

But stay, we must not think the day is our own, the Adversary begins to rally, and pushes

upon us with his ſtrong Reſerves, as thus, p. 268. *Thoſe Articles of the Crucifixion, Death, and Reſurrection of Chriſt were not propos'd here as the Fundamental Articles which St.* Peter *principally aim'd at, and endeavour'd to convince them of.* And afterwards, *They are not the Principal thing aim'd at,* p. 269. but only brought in by the bye. A Wager on it that he is good at *Puſh-pin.* None but ſuch a Triſler as the Vindicator could have been ſo ſhameleſs as to offer this to a Reader of any ſenſe and conſideration: for it is evident in this Sermon that our Saviour's *Crucifixion*, and *Death* and *Riſing again* are equally urged with his being *Lord* and *Chriſt:* And the Apoſtle mentions his *Reſurrection* again, *v.* 32. *This Jeſus hath God raiſed up,* and therefore exhorts his Country-men and Brethren to imbrace this *Jeſus,* to believe that he ſuffer'd, and laid down his life, and took it up again for the Good of the World. But our New Modeller of Chriſtianity tells us that theſe are Articles occaſionally brought in here by St. *Peter,* and only *as Arguments to perſwade* the Jews, but were far from being Fundamental and Neceſſary Points of Chriſtian Faith, ſuch as they muſt needs believe. And how doth he prove that theſe were brought in as *Arguments?* Ay, that is worth our taking notice of. *That our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death and Reſurrection were us'd here as Arguments to perſwade them into a belief of this Fundamental Article, that Jeſus was the Meſſias, is evident,* ſaith he, *from hence, that they preach'd here to thoſe who knew the death and crucifixion of Jeſus,*

as

as well as Peter, *and therefore they could not be propos'd to them as New Articles of Faith to be believ'd*, p. 269.

The answer is obvious, that though those Auditors knew as well as their Speaker that Christ suffer'd on the cross, and there expir'd, and rose again, yet they were ignorant of the Design and End of all this, *viz.* that he suffer'd, and died and rose from the dead for the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind. Thus they were *New Articles of Faith* to them, and thus St. *Peter* proposed them to be believ'd and receiv'd, as appears from that Question of those Jews who were converted by this Sermon, *What shall we do to be saved?* Which implies that St. *Peter* had told them Christs Death and Resurrection were in order to the Salvation of lost mankind: and therefore they desire to know what Method they must take to have the Benefit of that Salvation and Redemption; and accordingly he exhorts them to *Repent, and to be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins*, v. 38. These Jews were before strangers to this, they had no perswasion concerning the Design of Christs Suffering, Dying, and Rising again, *viz.* that Salvation and Pardon of sins were to be obtain'd by them, and therefore the Apostle preaches tehse Truths to them. And that they are the *Principal* Doctrines in this Sermon appears from their being insisted upon so largely, from v. 23, to 36. but as for that Other Article, that *Jesus is the Messias*, it is not expresly mention'd throughout the whole Sermon, only

only the ſubſtance of it is in ver. 36, after the other Grand Articles of Chriſts Paſſion and Dying and Riſing had been amply diſcours'd of and urg'd. And yet our Bold Breeder up of Small Craft faces it out that that was the *Sole Propoſition and the Sole Truth the Apoſtle labour'd to convince them of, and to bring them to.* p. 270. and that the Others are no Fundamental Articles. Our new Theologue is for a *Meſſias* that neither *Suffer'd*, nor *died*, nor *roſe again.*

I leave the Reader to judge of this, whilſt I follow our *Travelling Tutour* to p. 281. *&c.* where we ſtill find him perverting of St. *Luke's* Writing. He ſets himſelf to miſrepreſent his Hiſtory both of the *Goſpel* and of the *Acts*, as if he had a particular pike againſt that Good Man, that Holy Writer, above all the reſt.

From p. 209. to p. 299. he undertakes to ſet down the Contents of our Saviour's and the Apoſtle's Preaching, and thence to prove that *One Article only* was propounded to be believ'd to make men Chriſtians. But our bold Undertaker falls very ſhort of what he deſigned, as I ſhall make evident from the Texts he alledges. Firſt, he quotes *Mat.* 4. 23. *Jeſus went about all Galilee, teaching in the Synagogues, and preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom*, called in the 17th v. *the Kingdom of heaven*, which is no other than the State of the Chriſtian Church under the Goſpel, with all the Great Benefits and Priviledges, as well as the Duties and Offices which appertain to it. This is the *Goſpel of the Kingdom*, even the *kingdom*

of

of heaven, for it is that Doctrine and Dispensation wherein Heaven and Happiness are freely offer'd to mankind, and whereby they may be made actual Partakers of them. This is that which Christ *taught* and *preach'd*, and thence our deep Logician infers that he taught and preach'd but *One Article*, as if the doctrine of the *kingdom of heaven* contain'd in it no more. Next he quotes *Mat.* 10. 7. where our Lord enjoin'd his Apostles *to preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.* And he adds *Luke* 10. 9. where our Saviour commands the Seventy Disciples to give and preach to the Inhabitants of some particular places in *Judea*, and *to say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.* Which is as much as to say, Go and preach the same Gospel that I my self have taught, for this is the Sum of what I have every where publish'd and preach'd, *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand, Mat.* 4. 17. Reform your lives, and embrace that Doctrine which approaches nearer and nearer unto you every day, and is more and more to be discover'd to the world. It is no less then the doctrine of the *Kingdom of God, i. e.* Gods spiritual Government of his Church under the reign of the *Messias* the Saviour and Redeemer: wherefore you must be careful to inform your selves concerning the Laws of this Spiritual Kingdom, and to know and believe them, as well as to practise them. If a Man can prove hence that there is but *One Article* in all Christianity to be assented to, to constitute a person a member of Christ, he hath a faculty

of

of Proving which none ever heard of before.

Well, but why doth he not go on? He had undertaken to prove the One Article from the *Commission* given by our Saviour to his Apostles and his Disciples, and why then doth he not proceed, and quote *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. among his other Texts that he produces? This is worth the Readers taking notice of, for it will discover to him the Genius and Spirit of the man we are now dealing with. Though he had taken upon him to set down and rehearse the several particular *Commissions* our Saviour gave the Apostles and Disciples when he sent them to preach the Gospel yet he omits this most Solemn order of all, whereby they and their Successors were enjoyn'd to *teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things &c.* They were to convert all Nations to the Faith of the Gospel, and to make them Christs *Disciples* (for the word is μαθητευσατε) by baptizing them into the profession of the Holy *Trinity*; and consequently they were to be instructed in this doctrine, in order to their being made Christians: they must know and believe that in the Eternal Godhead there are Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; this is propounded as requisite in order to their being admitted and constituted *Disciples* of *Jesus*. If the *Vindicator* had not been conscious to himself that this is the True Sense and Import of the Text, it is certain he would have produc'd it among the other places: but

(which

(which is dismal to consider) he stifles the inward sentiment of his Conscience, to secure his One Article; for he saw that the Article of the *Trinity* was plainly expres'd in this *Commission*, and as plainly enjoin'd to be believ'd as a Necessary Point in order to give a man the denomination of a *Disciple of Christ*, or a *True Christian*; and for this reason our False *Masker* conceals this place, even when he was pretending to give an account of those Texts which mentioned our Blessed Saviours *Commissions* to his Apostles. This shews what a Perfidious Scribe we have got, one that makes nothing of wilfully leaving out any Text of Scripture, to further his design and purpose and at other times he as wilfully perverts plain Texts to the same end. The consideration of which strange behaviour, will I doubt not, obtain me an Excuse among Impartial and Intelligent Readers for my manner of handling this Adversary, whose obstinate Hypocrisy and dissimulation call for no other than the severest Chastisements and Corrections: though I confess it is with no mean regret and reluctancy that I put my self upon this way of writing; but there is no help for it in the present case; he must of necessity be disciplined and *taught*, as *the men of Succoth, with Thorns and Briars.* I should not have undertaken this task upon my own private and personal account, because *Contempt*, and *Neglect* are the best Return in this case: but when I saw our Holy Religion endanger'd by his sacrilegious attempts of depriving us of the greatest part of it, and when I observ'd his

Rude

Rude encroachments on the Profeſs'd Schools of Learning, I found it was a *Publick Cauſe*, and that every one, who would, had a right to engage in it, and to oppoſe him as a Common Foe, as a Proclaim'd Rebel, as an Out-Law, as a Peſt of the Community, and to treat him accordingly.

I will ſtay a little to examine one ridiculous paſſage p. 304. I had offer'd to prove that there is more than that One Article, *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, to be believ'd to make a man a Chriſtian, by producing that place *Rom.* 10.9. *If thou ſhalt believe in thy heart that God raiſed him* (i. e. Chriſt Jeſus) *from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved*: where the belief of *Chriſts Reſurrection* is propounded as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation: and if ſo, then *Jeſus is the Meſſias* is not the Only Article, as he often inculcates. What is his Anſwer to this? *To believe the Reſurrection of Chriſt*, ſaith he, *is in effect the ſame as to believe him to be the Meſſias, and ſo is put to expreſs it.* And again p. 305. *Believing Chriſts Reſurrection is put for believing him to be the Meſſias*: ſo that theſe which ſeem to be Two Articles are but one and the ſame. And if they be ſo, then why throughout all his Collection of places out of the *Evangeliſts* and *Acts* did he not mention all thoſe Texts (which are very many) that ſpeak of our Saviour's *Reſurrection*, and why did he not reckon them to be the ſame with thoſe that ſpeak of *Jeſus*'s being the *Meſſias*? Why did he not all along tell us that *one is put to expreſs the other*? The true Reaſon is becauſe he thought of no ſuch thing at that time, but

but hath invented it since, to shift off what I said.

This is such an other piece of Invention as that in his *First Vindication* p. 6. that *he designed his Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity chiefly for Infirm Christians, such as disbelievʼd or doubted of the Truth of Christianity*: and again in his *Second Vindication* p. 152. he saith, *he chiefly designʼd his book for Deists.* (though by the way we may take notice of his Contradicting himself, for *Deists* are no *Christians*, and if he design'd his book *chiefly* for one, he cou'd not design it *chiefly* for the other.) And yet if you consult his whole Treatise of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, you shall not find one syllable that intimates any such Design, though there, if any where, he was obliged to discover and declare it, that the Reader might not mistake the Intention of his book. This proves that what he hath since added in both his *Vindications* is mere Fiction and Sham, and he was forced to fly to this Asylum when I had laid open the mischief of his Papers. This may convince us that he will first assert and print any thing, and then afterwards he will (in his Sniveling way) come and Retract it, or gloss it over with some pitiful Evasion. But where is the Probity, where is the Integrity of the Man all this while?

Nay, (to return to the Present Matter) it is plain that he designedly omitted those places which mention our Saviours *Resurrection*, because it was his perswasion that they belong not to this Propositon, *Jesus is the Messias.*

He

He declares (as you lately heard) that in St. *Peters* Sermon, Christs *Resurrection* (as well as his Sufferings and Death) was brought in only by the bye, *and was not a Principal Article, was not principally aym'd at*, but that this Proposition *Jesus is the Messias* is the *sole Truth* the Apostle labour'd to bring them to the belief of: and lately we were told by him that the *Resurrection* of Christ is no more to be believ'd to make a man a Christian, than any Ordinary Truth or Proposition recorded in the New Testament.

Yet after all this, he palpably contradicts what he hath said, and in plain terms tells us that *Christ's Resurrection* and *his being the Messias* are the very same, and *one is put to express the other*. Before he held them to be distinct, and so distinct, that where he found the one he could not find the other, as in several places of the New Testament that he consulted. The Resurrection of our Lord was not taken notice of by him as appertaining to the *Messiaship*. When St. *Peter* in the main part of his Sermon preached concerning Christ's Resurrection, our Expositor told us that *it was made use of only as an Argument* to perswade them of this Fundamental Truth, that *Jesus is the Messias*, p. 269. and yet now all of a sudden this Proposition is *equivalent*, nay is the *same* with *Jesus rose from the dead*. There is no account in the world can be given of this, but that he will be saying something, though it be to his own apparent Confutation. See here the Influence of Company! It is a Common Topick, but the Reality of it could never

never be more evinced than in this Inſtance. Here we ſee how it tinctures mens Manners, and transforms them into the ſhapes of thoſe they aſſociate with. Here is one that hath ſpent his days among Talking and Goſſiping people, and they have made him ſuch a one as themſelves: He hath learnt of them the knack of Perpetual Jabbering, and his Tongue will wag when the Sexton is covering him with Moulds. But if this were all, we might paſs it off with a little mirth: But alas it is diſmal and horrid to conſider what a Profligate Writer ſhews his Head in the World, who is neither aſhamed to contradict himſelf nor the Holy Writings of the Apoſtles: And ſo he brings a contempt on the things of God and Religion, and vacates the Authority of Scripture, only to gratify ſome of his Fraternity, who with himſelf have a deſign to ſmother the Chief Articles of our Religion, and to ſtifle the Chriſtian Faith.

P. 344, 345, *&c.* he is mightily Concern'd (if you will believe him) that he ſhould be thought to favour *Socinianiſm*. What Evidence I brought for it he labours to render invalid, but with little ſucceſs. He would maintain forſooth, that though I have proved him a *Socinian*, yet he is no *Socinian*; and what if he be both? May not a man be a *Socinian* and no *Socinian*, as well as a *Phyſitian* and no *Phyſitian*? But he farther complains that *he is the firſt man that was ever found out to be at the ſame time a Socinian and a Factor for* Rome, p. 346. No, Sir, you are miſtaken here (as in all your other Points) you are

not the *first man*, for there was a *Jesuit* in the late Reign (as a profess'd Socinian owns, in his *Exceptions of Mr.* E. *examin'd*, p. 46.) who publish'd a Paper entituled, *An Address*, &c. wherein he pretends to shew that the Scriptures commonly alledged for the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, and for the *Trinity*, admit of an other sense. And this Paper was read by the Jesuite-Preacher in *Limestreet*, and zealously urged by him in his Pulpit. Whence it is evident that *Popish* Priests, when they see it makes for their Interest, cry up the *Socinian* Principles and Doctrines. A *Jesuite* can appear in all shapes and figures, as well as a *Vindicator*, and that is the reason that our *Vindicator* mention'd not this when he was enumerating the Properties of a *Jesuite*, for he knew well enough that he could assume the guise of a *Quaker*, or a *Socinian*, or any other Sect; and therefore a *Socinian* and a *Factor for Rome* are not inconsistent. Which proves that the *Vindicator* had no cause to complain of my coupling these Two together, and that it was as weakly as falsly said of him, that he was *the first man* in whom both these Denominations meet. *Socinianism* was first brought out of *Italy*, and thither it tends.

Our *Runnagate Tutor* being almost out of breath with Impertinent Nonsense and Repetitions, begins to sit down, and take up with Quotations, p. 350: and of whom? Of *two Orthodox Prelates of our Church.* But whereever he mentions that word *Orthodox*, he intends it for a Jeer, so that those Worthy Persons he gives that Epithet to are much oblig'd

to

to him for his Buffoonry. But that is not all, they *are two Prelates*, he saith, *whom, when he follows Authorities, he shall prefer to* Slichtingius *and* Socinus (the good man thinks *Socinus* was after *Slichtingius.*) Here is the Honour that is done to those Eminent Men of our Church; he can only give them the preference to two Notorious Corrupters of our Christian Faith. What an impudent affront is this to the Ashes of the late Archbishop, and to the Right Reverend Bishop now living, from the Pen of this *Episcopus Puerorum*, this Contemptible Overseer of Hanging-Sleeves? *When he follows Authorities*, is as much as to say, *he never will*, for our Puny-Governor is *Authority* to himself. Thus he quotes those Excellent Prelates only to abuse them, and to distort their words, as may be seen in what he saith of them. And it is very observable that this man who scorns *Authorities*, yet brags in an other place that * *he hath Great Authorities to justify him:* And in what? *viz.* that the Soul of Man is Material. Here our good Gentleman can depend upon *Authorities*, and call them *Great* Ones, when they shock the *Immortality* of Humane Souls, but in a Point of Orthodox Faith he laughs at *Authorities.*

This Ignorant Writer stands to what he said before, that [*the Son of God*] *was a phrase that among the Jews in our Saviour's time was used for* [*the Messias.*] p. 357. Which hath no foundation at all, and none but the man that talks of the *Mishna*, and never saw it,

* Letter to the Bishop of *Worcester*, p. 69.

would have asserted any such thing. Mr. *Selden*, who, it is thought, was the better Antiquary and Judge in this matter, expressly tells us, that *by* [*the Son of God*] *the Jews meant* [*the Word of God*] (*as he is called in the Chaldee Paraphrast*) *which was the same as if he had profess'd himself to be God*. De Jure Nat. & Gent. l. 2. c. 12. For the Old Jews belief was (as several Good Authors have proved) that the Messias was *God*, or the *Son of God*, for they look'd upon the *Son of God* as Synonymous with *God*, when it is applied to the *Messias*. *Rittangel*, a Learned Writer, who had been a Jew, sufficiently proves this from the Jewish Writings. And from other Testimonies it might be proved that *the Son of God* was not a term only to express the *Messias*, but that it signified something more, *viz.* That Jesus is the Proper, Natural and Eternal Son of God, that he is One with the Father, as having the same Divine Nature and Essence. Thus in the strictest sense he is the *Son of God*; and the Jews in our Saviour's time understood this expression thus, otherwise they would not have attempted to stone him for *Blasphemy*, *when he said he was the Son of God*; which according to them was the same with being *One with the Father*, *and making himself God*, Joh. 10. 30, 33, 36. Whence it is evident that *the Son of God* denotes the *Divinity* of Christ, which the word Messias doth not, and consequently *the Son of God* and the *Messias* are not terms of the very same signification. And that place Acts 8. 37. *I believe that Jesus Christ is the*

Son

Son of God, inefragrably proves it, which I urged in my former Treatiſe; but when the *Vindicator* came to repeat what I had alledg'd, he leaves out the words of the Text, as the Reader may ſee, p 370. which is an argument of his hating the Light. But as being aſhamed (which is prodigious in him) of that Omiſſion, he afterwards mentions the Text, and ſweats to evade the force of it. My Argument ran thus, If the *Eunuch*, who was inſtructed by *Philip* in the Chriſtian Faith, profeſs'd that he believed *Jeſus Chriſt* or the *Meſſias* to be the *Son of God*, then that word *Meſſias* or *Chriſt* is not of the very ſame ſignification with the *Son of God*, but imports ſomething elſe: But the Eunuch profeſs'd, *&c.* Therefore the word *Meſſias* is not of the ſame ſignification with the *Son of God*. The *Minor* is the Text: The Major is proved from this, that if the *Son of God* ſignified no more than the *Meſſias*, then the Eunuch's words are a downright Tautology, for they are as much as if he had ſaid, I believe that the Meſſias is the Meſſias. A man would think there is ſome ſenſe and reaſon in this way of Arguing. No, ſaith our Gentleman, I will not allow that there is any Senſe in this, for the *Tautology will be quite removed if we take* [Chriſt] *here for a proper Name*, p. 374. Say you ſo, Good Mr. *Vindicator!* Then why may not your One Article [*Jeſus is the Meſſias*] be reduced to this [Jeſus is he whom we call the Meſſias, or whoſe Proper Name is *Meſſiah*?] What is the reaſon that you did not take the word *Chriſt* for a *Proper Name* in all thoſe other

places where you alledge that Name to signify his Office? And what is the reason that the word *Messias* in your Collection of Texts may not be thought to be the same? Unless your Pedantship will say that a *Greek* word, but not an *Hebrew* or *Syriack* one is capable of being a *Proper Name?* You see the strength of our Adversary. After so many years plodding and booking it he cannot afford any other then such weak insipid trash as this. Get thee gone, I say to thee, for a maker of poor thin *Physick-broth.*

P. 399. he thinks it *Prophane* that I say of him, that *he makes our Saviour a Coward.* But if I prove that he represents him as such, then the Prophaneness will lie at his own door. Though, it is true, our Saviour used great Caution at the first Preaching of the Gospel, and did not on all occasions and to all persons declare himself to be the *Messias,* yet he was not so Reserv'd and Timerous as this Writer would have us believe, for he hath the confidence to say in his *Reasonableness of Christianity* that Christ *made no other discovery of himself at the beginning of his Ministry but by* Miracles *and Circumlocutions, and general Discourses,* p. 59. And in an other place of that Book he saith he did this lest the *Sanhedrim should have laid hold on what he said, to have got him into their power, and thereby to take away his life,* p. 62. And afterwards he saith, our Saviour would by no means *in express terms profess himself to be the* Messias, p. 72. and that for the same reason. Nay, he tells us that out of this wary and cautious principle he never

in

in the whole course of his Ministry, *so much as to his Disciples, much less to the multitude, or the Rulers of the Jews, declared himself to be the* Messias *in expres terms*, p. 148. And in almost a hundred pages together, (*viz.* from p. 59. to p. 152.) he labours to instill this Notion into the minds of his Readers, that our Blessed Lord had not Courage enough to own himself to be the Messias, the views of *Danger* hindred him from letting the world know Who he was.

But how contrary is this to what we read in the Evangelical Writings? When the women of *Samaria* had mentioned the Messias, *John* 4. 25. Christ immediately thereupon said unto her, *I that speak unto thee am he*, i. e. the *Messias*. Here in plain and direct words he owns himself to be the *Messias*, and this was at the very entrance of his Ministry. Again, we are assured that *he went about all Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom*, Mat. 4. 23. i. e. that the *Messias* was come, and that he himself was that *Messias*, for it was no more dangerous to proclaim himself to be the Messias, than to tell the Jews that the *Messias* was come, for they would soon know what Particular Person it was. Further, though our Saviour (as is particularly taken notice of by the Evangelists) shew'd his Prudence and Discretion in not exposing himself to unnecessary dangers by too great a freedom of speaking, yet at the beginning of his Ministry we find that he plainly, and without any reserve told the Jews that *God was his Father*, *John* 5. 17. or, which is equivalent, that *he*

was the Son of God, which is as much as if he had ſaid, *he was God*; for ſo the Jews interpreted it in that place, for they ſaid this was *making himſelf equal with God*, v. 18. He told them at the ſame time that *he had power to raiſe the dead*, v. 21. and that he is to be *Judg* of the world at the laſt day, *v.* 22, 27. that *all men ought to honour him as they honour the Father*, v. 23. that he gives *Eternal Life* to thoſe that believe on him, *v.* 24. and more fully and amply in other expreſſions in that Chapter he publickly and expreſly declares himſelf to be the Meſſias and the *Son of God*. And it is obſervable that he made this free, plain and open profeſſion of himſelf, and his Divine Nature, and Meſſiaſhip at that very time when the *Jews perſecuted him, and ſought to ſlay him*, v. 16.

Judg then of the Truth and Conſiſtency of what this Dabler in Scripture and Divinity ſaith of our Saviour, viz. That *in the whole courſe of his Miniſtry* he never expreſly declared himſelf to be the *Meſſias* Nay, (which makes it the more unaccountable and prodigious) he holds that Chriſt never all that time own'd himſelf to be the *Meſſias*, although according to him, there was no other Article of Faith propounded by Chriſt and the Apoſtles to be believ'd to make a man a Chriſtian but this, that *Jeſus is the Meſſias*. Judg of the truth of what he ſaith, *viz.* that our Saviour *always ſpoke to the* Jews (whether his own Apoſtles and Diſciples, or others) *concerning himſelf in obſcure and myſtical terms*, p. 99. as being afraid to ſpeak out, and ſtanding in awe of

of the *Angry Jews, who sought to kill him*, p. 85. Is not this clearly confuted by what I have alledged out of the *Gospels*, and is it not further confuted by what we read in Mat. 10. 28, 32? where our Saviour dissuades his Apostles from *fearing them that kill the body*, and requires it of them as their duty that they *confess him before men*, i. e. (as is most evident from comparing *John* 9. 22. with 12. 4.) that they *confess him to be the* Messias. And can we think that they were obliged to do this unless he had plainly told them that he was the *Messias*? But, according to this New Expositor, Christ exacted more of his Apostles than he dared to do himself; for he was Cautious and Fearful, and therefore would not confess himself to be the *Messias*; he had not Spirit and Valour enough to own that Character *in the whole course of his* Ministry, lest he should thereby be in *danger of his life*, as he expresses it. What is this but belying our Blessed Saviour, and *making him a Coward*? And who but a *Poltron*, a Cowardly Flincher from the Fundamental Articles of our Faith would entertain such a vile and impious thought of our Lord and Master?

It is pleasant to see p. 222. (which should indeed have been mention'd before) how this Imperious Dragger up of Youth handles the Antient Grave *Citizen* who dedicated a Book to him, and most submissively crouch'd to him. In stead of acknowledging his good will and respect to him, this Supercilious and Unmannerly *Well bred man* snibs him for his *forwardness*, and condemns him as a *System-Maker*,

Maker, though the poor man had rail'd in three or four places of his Pamphlet againſt all *Syſtems*. What a Magotted *Vindicator* is this?

Now our *Pilgrim* is approaching towards his journeys end, and therefore p 403. *&c.* ſpends his languid remains upon Mr. *Bold's* feeble Vindication of him; where he hath made his caſe worſe (if it be poſſible) then it was, and involves him further in ſelf-contradiction. But ſeeing the *Weſtern Gentleman* was ſo loving and friendly to to the *Creed-hater*, this ſame *Creed-hater* was reſolv'd, right or wrong, to aſſert and vindicate whatever that Gentleman ſaid, it dropping from the pen of ſo Dear a Friend, who did what he could to help our lame *Vindicator* over the ſtile. Though afterwards he ſhews him a Dog-trick p. 440. where he ſnarls (but covertly) againſt him: he diſapproves of Mr. *Bold's indiſpenſable neceſſity* which he ſpeaks of. But becauſe he muſt not ſeem to fall out with him ſo ſoon after ſworn friendſhip, he makes a Diſtinction between *abſolute* and *conditional neceſſity*, and ſo compromiſes the matter. Now all is well again, and Mr. *Lock* and Mr. *Bold* are as Great as two Inkle-makers. Now the ſtile runs thus, *Mr. Bold and I ſay* p. 448. *I follow Mr. Bolds order* p. 449. *Mr. Bold's reaſoning is clear and ſtrong* p. 468. becauſe he reaſons for *him*. Now you'l find Mr. *Lock* vouching every ſyllable that Mr. *B.* ſaith, ſenſe or nonſenſe: he ſwallows all down, and ſordidly licks up his drivel (as he doth his own in his Loathſom Repetitions) and defiles and infects his Paper with it. Nay he ſolemnly engages for

for him for the future, *I dare answer*, saith he, *for Mr. Bold*, 418. (But have a care Sir, of *satisfying*; remember that, I pray) if he shall please to turn *Turk*, and read Lectures to me out of the *Alcoran*, I promise to attend to him.

Our *Stroling Tutor* pretends to tell us p. 451. *what answering with ill language is call'd in his Country*: but let him first prove that a *Vagrant* is of any Country.

There are several other Passages in this Authors Bundle of Sheets which I might reflect upon: but lest I should be thought to be too Severe and Unmerciful to him, I will here hold my hand. I hate to insult over a poor *Worm* of what sort or denomination so ever; otherwise I would here rifle and uncase the Whole Bloated Pamphlet that is before us, and let the world further see what a miserable Arguer, what a poor Manager of Controversies we have got, and offer some other incontestable proofs of his design to erect a *New* and *Maimed Christianity* in opposition to the *Old Catholick* one. It is but some part of his Paper-Fardel that I have handled: perhaps when I have perused the rest, he may hear further from me. I deal with him as he doth with his Bantlings, I don't cram and gorg him, but give him a little at a time. I have thrice as much more to say to him about his *Vindication*, besides a Just Set of Animadversions on some other parts of his *Education*, whence (if I see Occasion) I shall make it appear that he is neither fit to teach *Children* nor *Men*. And I hope I shall do good service to Church and State in further unmasking of him.

Brief

Brief Animadverſions on a late Reply *of Mr.* Bold, *of* Steeple *in* Dorſet-ſhire, *to what I had writ againſt his Defence of the* One Article.

THere is a neceſſity of making ſome Addition here, unleſs I ſhould give the Reader the trouble of a Formal Anſwer to ſome thing that Mr. *Bold* (one of Mr. *L's* Proſelytes) hath lately publiſh'd, and unleſs I ſhould ſend it to the Preſs by it ſelf. Which I find there is no reaſon to do, becauſe ſome very *brief Animadverſions* on that Author's feeble Attempt will ſerve the turn. It is the unhappineſs of this Gentleman, who I think means well as to the main, that he hath eſpous'd a Groundleſs and Unſcriptural Notion, and then thinks himſelf obliged to vindicate it. Good man, he is eaſily warped, as his beſt Friends complain and lament. They allow him to be ſerviceable in an honeſt Practical Diſcourſe, but find him not able to diſcern the Merits of a Cauſe in Controverſy, or, if he did, to manage it aright. If you will believe him, he is a man of a *Cold Phlegmatick*

matick complexion, p. 24. and he often boasts himself to be one of *Temper* and *Mildness*. But then he must mean it thus, that he comes sober and gentle to destroy our Religion, and to shatter Christianity, of which he hath given us sufficient proof in these as well as in his former papers.

Nay, we must not think him to be so *Phlegmatick* and *Mild* as he would perswade his Readers he is, for I assure you he comes on like a Smart Antagonist, and falls upon me without Mercy, as well as without Judgment. He complains of *Vineger in my Ink* p 4. but let the Reader judg what *Gall* there is in his, when he charges me with *coarse treating*. Pref. p. 3. *weak and sorry stuff* p. 46 *jumbling* p. 24. *banter* p. 2. *imperious rambling* Pref. p. 16. Nay, he rises higher, and declares that he finds in my papers *Railing* p. 52. *sulphureous eruptions* p. 47. *Malignity* Pref. p. 4. nay (to consummate all) *Antichristianism*. Pref. p. 4. You see the man disgorges *choler*, in stead of *Phlegm*. He hath got heart of late from his new Friendship and League with the *Vindicator*, whose upstart Conceits he is resolv'd to defend, and especially the *One Article*, though it be with defiance of all the other parts of Christianity. Accordingly he declares with much confidence that the *belief of Jesus's being the Messias is the* ONLY *Article indispensably necessary to make a man a Christian*, and (as the Consequence of that) that the belief of *more* is unnecessary. Pref. p. 4.

Which is as much as if he should speak thus to his Auditors, "There are a great many

"Mini-

" Miniſters of the Goſpel that hold it is ne-
" ceſſary to the making a man a *Chriſtian* that
" he ſhould believe ſeveral Truths and Doc-
" trines recorded in the New Teſtament, as
" that *we are by nature the children of wrath*,
" that we are freed from this wrath by the
" Meritorious and All-ſufficient Undertakings
" of *Chriſt Jeſus* who is both *God* and *Man*;
" that he gave himſelf a *Sacrifice* for us, and
" ſatisfied Divine Juſtice by paying an Infinite
" *Price* for us; that hereby he hath purchaſed
" Juſtification, Pardon of ſins, and Eternal
" Life for us; that this Saviour and Redeem-
" er roſe from the dead, and is exalted unto
" Glory, and will judg the quick and the dead
" at his laſt appearing. But, my Friends, I
" muſt tell you, thoſe that preach theſe doc-
" trines as neceſſary to be known and believ'd
" in order to make men members of Chriſt
" and of his Church, talk idly and impertinent-
" ly, and are not at all to be attended to. For
" it is my opinion, and I have preach'd to you,
" and I have thrice printed it, that none of
" thoſe foreſaid doctrines which either Jeſus
" Chriſt or his Apoſtles deliver'd, are neceſ-
" ſary to be believ'd to give you a Title to
" Chriſtianity. You and I may be true Chri-
" ſtians though we are ignorant of every one
" of thoſe Doctrines before rehears'd, though
" we know nothing of the nature and intent
" of them, nay though we never heard of
" them: for there is but *One* Article of Faith,
" and no more, that is required to make us
" Chriſtians, and that is this, that *Jeſus is the*
" *Meſſias*. If you believe this, take it upon
" my

" my word, you need nothing more (I mean
" as to matter of *Faith*) to make you True and
" Living Members of Christ. This alone is
" that which properly deserves the Name of
" *Justifying Faith*, and is that Faith which
" God will impute to a man for Righteous-
" ness. I have been blamed by several of my
" Brethren in the Ministry for preaching and
" printing such doctrines as this, and they have
" baffled me (as they think) out of the Holy
" Scriptures, and have demonstrated that there
" are sundry *other Points of Faith* that are re-
" quired to be believ'd in order to the making
" a man a Christian; but I can't be brought
" to listen to what they say. Neither Church-
" men nor Dissenters shall bring me off from
" this perswasion. I will rather stick to Worthy
" Mr. *Hobbs* and Mr *Lock* then part with
" my Opinion at the sollicitation of Thousands
" of Divines and other Christians whom they
" call *Orthodox*. I'm chiefly confirm'd in this
" Notion by the latter of those Gentlemen
" whom I named, who cruises up and down
" the Countries to propagate this doctrine,
" and I hope will take *Steeple* in his Circuit
" very suddenly, and then he will further sa-
" tisfy you (though I should not have used
" that word *Satisfying* because it is so hateful
" to him) and instruct you in that and some o-
" ther matters relating to Religion, which no
" Christian ear ever heard of before.

After Mr. *Bold* had asserted the *Darling Proposition*, he presents us with an other, which is no less strange and monstrous, and from whence we may guess at the Character

of

of the Man, who is Mr. *L's* humble admirer. His expreſs words are theſe, Pref. p. 5. *A mans knowing that Jeſus Chriſt hath revealed ſuch a doctrine, brings him not under an Obligation to believe it, but he may, notwithſtanding that, withold his Aſſent.* This is the maxim of Mr. *L's New Chriſtian*, but the Miſchievous Ingredients of it are ſufficient to ſhew the nature and deſign of this Writer: for though he will perhaps ſay that he delivers that afterwards which is contrary to the interpretation which I make of theſe words, yet the Anſwer is plain, that he makes nothing of Contradicting himſelf, and therefore this is no Plea. He can ſay, and unſay, as he thinks fit, of which I gave ſeveral Inſtances in my *Reflections* on what he writ before. This then is no excuſe at all, but rather ſhews his *Weakneſs*, that he can't tell when he talks inconſiſtently; or his *Inſincerity* and *Perverſeneſs*, that he will make uſe of Contrarieties to ſerve his own ends. I know likewiſe he will ſay that he ſpeaks this of thoſe Doctrines the belief whereof doth not conſtitute a man a Chriſtian, but this is a mere Evaſion, and he can't poſſibly make uſe of it with any ſhadow of Senſe; for if you ask him what thoſe Doctrines are, he will tell you that they are thoſe which I before ſpecified, and reckon'd as *Fundamentals* of Chriſtianity. But he denies them to be *ſuch*, and he can't do otherwiſe; for if there be but *One* Article of Faith neceſſarily to be believ'd to make a man a Chriſtian (which is the thing he ſo ſtiffly maintains) then all the reſt are not neceſſary to be believ'd to make him ſo, or to denominate him to be ſuch. Ha-

Having thus prevented and obviated the Cavils which he might ſtart, I'll now very concisely preſent unto the Reader a few Remarks on that Propoſition which I quoted out of Mr. *B*'s laſt printed Papers, *viz.* that *I knowing that Chriſt hath reveal'd ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine, brings not a man under an obligation to believe it, but he may notwithſtanding that with hold his aſſent.*

Firſt, this baffles the *end* of Chriſt's revealing his doctrines to the Sons of men, for without doubt they were reveal'd for this very purpoſe, that we ſhould yield aſſent to them. But this Gentleman tells you that there is no ſuch thing, *Revelation* hath no affinity with *Aſſent*, and therefore this could not be the End and Deſign of that. And herein he follows the Patern ſent him by a late Writer in his *Chriſtianity not myſterious*, p. 38. *Divine Revelation*, ſaith he, *is not a motive of Aſſent, nor a ground of our perſuaſion, or a reaſon we have to believe a thing, as if we were to receive it only becauſe reveal'd.*

Secondly, This ſeparates Knowledg from Belief, and makes Religion, and even Chriſtianity it ſelf a mere Notional Speculative thing. We may according to this Wiſe Shaper of Chriſtianity read the New Teſtament, and ſee what Chriſt and the Apoſtles deliver'd there as matter of Belief, but we are not under an obligation to believe what they delivered. We may, if we pleaſe, look into the *Goſpel* and the *Acts* (but have a care of peeping into the *Epiſtles*) and thence ſtock our ſelves with Propoſitions, and furniſh our

Brains with Knowledge, as well as our Tongues with ſomething to talk of, but we are excuſed from yielding *Aſſent* to the truth of them. Such a monſtrous Idea doth this Writer give us of that Sacred Inſtitution of the Bleſſed Jeſus.

Thirdly, This is bidding defiance to the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, for whoever refuſes to *believe* thoſe doctrines which are reveal'd in the Sacred Writings, doth in effect declare that thoſe Writings are not divinely inſpired. And yet Mr. L's Diſciple aſſures his Reader that though Truths and Doctrines be reveal'd in the Writings of the New Teſtament, yet we *are not obliged* to give credit to them, and to profeſs our belief of them: which is no other then annulling the Authority of the Scriptures.

Fourthly, This Aſſertion deſtroys that very *One Article* which he contends for, for if the revealing of a Truth obliges us not to believe it, then we may with hold our Aſſent to this Propoſition, *Jeſus is the Meſſias*, as well as to any Other; for ſeeing they are all equally reveal'd in the Scripture, we ought to make no difference. So that you ſee the poor *Fooliſh Builder* pulls down his own Structure with his own hands. The Beloved Article which he ſo much inſiſts upon is ruined by what he himſelf aſſerts. This is the juſt Judgment of God on ſuch audacious Innovators, and Depravers of Chriſtianity: Whileſt they are throwing down the Propoſitions which others with great reaſon aſſert, they demoliſh their own.

Fifthly

Fifthly and lastly, This wild Proposition of the *Replyer* is destructive of all *Reveal'd Religion.* Let there be never so many doctrines reveal'd to us by the Holy Spirit in the Divine Oracles, a Christian is *under no obligation* according to him to believe them, for all being alike *reveal'd* they may be equally disbelievʼd. This is the New Theology of our giddy Worshipper of that Idol Opinion of *One Article.* One would scarcely think that he should at this time of day have the confidence to talk after this rate, and to impose such dangerous and pernicious notions upon the world. Or, at least one would think that this Writer and his Fellow should not stare, and shew themselves so extraordinarily concern'd when we tell them that they are *Betrayers of Christianity.*

Having descanted on his Main Propositions, and seen what the dismal Contents of them are, I'll look into some other things which are most obvious in his *Reply.* I expected he would have attempted to purge himself of those *Self-Contradictions* which I laid to his charge, and proved in the plainest manner imaginable from his own words, which I faithfully set down; but he, like his brother-Criminal, denies all, but gives no reason why he doth so. He follows the example of the *Vindicator*, and unmercifully *Repeats* what he had said before: And all the rest is studied Evasion, Subterfuge, Whiffling. It is in vain to mention all the Particulars; it shall suffice to propound to the Reader's view one of them, and from that let him guess at all the others.

I had been proving in my *Reflections* on Mr. *B.* the Abſurdity of the Opinion of *One Article*, and had ſhew'd how he contradicted himſelf, one Inſtance whereof was this, that he had ſaid, that *a True Chriſtian is as much oblig'd to believe that the Holy Spirit is God, as to believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt* (which are his own words) and yet he ſaith, *There is but that One Article* [*Jeſus is the Meſſias*] *to be believ'd to make a man a Chriſtian* Whence I inferr'd (and whether juſtly or no, let the Reader judge) that he ſpoke things repugnant and contradictory; for if a True Chriſtian be *as much oblig'd* to believe one as the other, then it is certain that a man can't be a True Chriſtian without believing both, and if there be a neceſſity of believing both to make a man a True Chriſtian, then the belief of one only is not enough. Now, mind what the *Replyer* ſaith to this, and how fallaciouſly and ſophiſtically he diſcourſes, p. 19. *It is as neceſſary for me*, ſaith he, *to believe that Jeſus was at* Cana *of* Galilee, *and turn'd Water into Wine there, as it is that he was crucified without the Gates of* Jeruſalem, *becauſe I have the ſame evidence for the one that I have for the other. But I can not ſay it is of as much Importance for a man to know the one, as it is to know the other; much leſs can I ſay that no man can be a Chriſtian till he knows and believes that Jeſus was at* Cana *in* Galilee, *&c.* Which is ſo extraneous and foreign, and every ways ſo impertinent and inconſiſtent, that if one did not know with what Writer this Gentleman ſymbolizes, it might create aſtoniſhment to hear

hear ſuch a ſenſleſs and incoherent application of theſe words: for whereas I had aſſerted that a man can't be a True Chriſtian unleſs he believes other Articles and Doctrines, (*viz.* ſuch as I have mention'd before) as well as that *One* of *Jeſus's* being the *Chriſt*; and accordingly to diſprove this he ſhould have ſhew'd that *thoſe Articles* are not as neceſſary to be believ'd as that *Single one* he mentions, he (not regarding the matter he was about) produces ſome Hiſtorical paſſages out of the New Teſtament, *viz.* Chriſt's being at *Cana of Galilee*, and turning Water into Wine there, *&c.* and then thinks (though one would think it is impoſſible he ſhould) he hath effected what he undertook. But doth not any conſiderate man ſee that there is no compariſon between theſe things which he alledges and thoſe other before ſpoken of, between the belief of ſome *Hiſtorical Circumſtances* and the belief of the *Grand Fundamental Points* of the Chriſtian Religion? Is there not a vaſt difference between theſe *Inferiour Truths* and thoſe that are of an *Higher nature*, even ſuch as are of the Eſſence of Chriſtianity, and have Immediate reſpect to the Salvation of our Souls? Though the belief of the former be not abſolutely neceſſary to make a man a Chriſtian, doth it follow thence that the belief of the latter is not neceſſarily requiſite for that purpoſe? Who but the *Replyer* and the *Vindicator* (for he takes his part as to this very thing in his *Vindication*) could firſt imagine any ſuch thing, and then puhliſh it to the world? What Talent of Reaſoning Mr. *B.*

had before he undertook this Cauſe of the *One Article*, I can't tell; but ſince I am ſure he is a very poor Arguer, and makes out nothing of what he pretends to, but fills up his pages with weak, dilute ſtuff, yea without any daſh of what is ſprightly and generous.

And that he and his Cauſe run very low, is evident from what he ſaith, p. 24. in defence of his One Article. *The Notion*, ſaith he, *of One Article may induce thoſe who embrace it, to eſteem more Perſons Chriſtians than the other Notion can allow of. And thus far I fancy* (and you ſay right, Good Sir, it is no more than a *fancy*) *the advantage is on the former's ſide, for I conceive there is no hurt in letting Charity, as well as Patience, have its perfect work.* Thus he; and he is pleas'd to confeſs that *this is the ſuggeſtion that comes from a cold Phlegmatick temper.* If he means that it is very flat and dull, I think every body will agree with him. Tho truly we muſt grant that here are ſome footſteps of *Ingenuity* (ſuch as it is) for here is ſet forth the *True Cauſe* why this doctrine of *One Single Article* is ſo vigorouſly urg'd at this day, and even upheld by Penſions Old *Reynard* would not ſay a ſyllable of this throughout his whole Treatiſe of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, and his two *Vindications* of it. He thought it was too groſs and broad, therefore the Diſſembler conceal'd it. But Unwary Mr. *Bold*, who tells all he knows, acquaints us with the true and proper deſign of the ſetting up of One Article, and the furious appearing againſt all the reſt. By this means, ſaith he, we ſhall have *more Chriſtians* (ſuch as they

they are) then ever were before. There are many that will imbrace One Point of Christianity, who will refuse to own the rest, so that we shall have *Christians* in abundance. But whether they be *True Christians*, or whether they be *esteem'd* to be such (that is his word) is not material: but we shall have the *Number* of these latter much increas'd and that's enough. And besides, saith he, we shall have more *Charity* (and *there is no hurt* in that:) when there is but *One Single Article* of Christian Faith, we shall all Agree, and what a fine world shall we have then?

Ay but, Sir, would it not be a better world if there were *no Article at all*, and then besure there could be no Contention? whereas now there is occasion for it, for some will not allow of the *One Article* you speak of. Therefore according to your own way of Arguing it were best to throw off that One Article, and with it all the other Fundamental and Necessary doctrines of our Christan Faith, and then it is certain we shall have no Point of Faith to fall out about, and *Charity* will ride in triumph, and yours and Mr. *L's Christianity* shall bear it company in the same Triumphal Seat. This is the force and strength of our Author's Reasoning, whatever he may pretend. Surely *Steeple* is well taught when such a one is their instructer. Who would have thought that there is such a Pious Contriver for Religion in any part of the Kings dominions? Who could have thought that All the Fundamental Principles of our Faith (except one) were to be cashier'd to make way for *Charity*?

And who can think that the *One Article* ſo much talk'd of will remain long without the reſt? And, in a word, what man of ſenſe and ſobriety can think that theſe wild Notions are not ſpread abroad on purpoſe to ſubvert the Foundations of Chriſtianity, and to bring in Infidelity, and to turn us out to the herd of *Deiſts* and next to *Atheiſts*? Let not Mr. *Bold* ſay that theſe are *Gueſſes* (as in one place I remember he ſaith I am a *Gueſſer*, becauſe I am a *Critick*, which is as much ſenſe according to his applying of it, as if one ſhould ſay he is a *Conjurer* becauſe he is *Rector of Steeple*:) No, Sir, here is no Conjecture for the thing that I ſay is plain and obvious, and depends upon natural and rational conſequences, and we every day ſee more and more the truth of it.

As Dull and *Phlegmatick* as he is, his Invention is ripe, witneſs that horrid Fiction and Falſe Imputation p. 25. line 3, *&c.* But I muſt not ſtand upon theſe things.

Then he would argue from the uſe of the term *Chriſtian* p. 25. that there is but *One Article*. which is ſo poor and mean that he *deſerves* to (be what he is) Mr. *Locks Second* in the preſent Combate. Yet he hath ſo good an opinion of this which he ſuggeſts, that he ſaith, *It may afford ſome light to this matter*. No, Sir, there is no ſuch thing as *Light* here only a *Wooden Candle-ſtick*. I am loth to ſuppoſe any *Braſs* about it, though one would wonder how he could have that face to offer any ſuch thing as this to prove that there is but *One Article* to be believ'd to conſtitute a Chriſtian man, which was the matter he undertook.

Our

Our Mushrom-Scribe is drawn to the dreggs, and in his next Paragraphs doth nothing but Cant, and Hover in Obscure and Ambiguous terms: but hath not a dram of Reason left, as the Reader cannot but own, if he had nothing else to do but to consult the pages.

Then he *Catechises* his Friends, p. 29, 30, 31. and makes sorry work of it, but at last it is observable how this Wild Reasoner, who had been all along in his *Reply* (as well as in his former Papers) endeavouring to assert the necessity of but *One Article* in Christianity, and opposing what I had said in behalf of *More Articles*, it is observable (I say) that at last he gives up the Cause, and meekly prostrates himself to what I had offered: *Let a man believe*, saith he, *never so many particular doctrines taught by Christ and his Apostles, that belief will prove no more but that he believes Jesus is the Messias*, p. 32. If the believing of *many doctrines* taught by Christ and his Apostles be the same with believing that *One doctrine*, why then hath he made all this stir? for if *many will prove no more than one*, then *vice versa*, *one will prove to be many*; and if his *One Arcicle* be thus *multiplied*, than why doth he quarrel with me for asserting Many Articles?

But still there must be (whatever comes of it) but *One Article*, and he undertakes to prove it, p. 36. from St. *John*'s words, *Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*, 1 John 5. 1. *Which every one*, saith he, *I suppose will acknowledg to be as much as to say, a Christian.* And thence infers, *If the belief*

of

of more Articles was absolutely necessary to make a person a Christian, it could not with truth be said, Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. Which is a farther proof of the Shallowness, or (which is worse) of the willful Obstinacy of this blind Worshiper of the Idol that Mr. *Hobbs* and Mr. *Lock* have set up: for any one that is moderately vers'd in this Epistle of St. *John* knows that it is a Collection of several Marks and Evidences whereby persons may examine and know whether they be True Believers, and Christians indeed; and among several others which he assigns this is one, that *they believe Jesus to be the Christ.* Now, can any one that is not very Weak or perverse infer hence, that the belief of *no other Article* but this is absolutely necessary to make a man a Christian? Is it not plain from other places in this Epistle that *Love to God* and *the brethren, keeping the Commandments*, &c. are Signs and Evidences of Regeneration, as well as *believing Jesus to be the Messias?* And why then upon the mentioning of this latter in the place forecited, must we conclude that none of those are absolutely necessary to make one a Christian or a Regenerate person? If we should follow Mr. *Bold*'s way of Interpreting, then, when it is said in this Epistle, *Every one that doth righteousness is born of God*, ch. 2. v. 29. we must infer that *doing of righteousness*, without any *believing*, gives us a title to *Regeneration:* And when it is said, *Every one that loveth* (which refers to *loving one an other* in the same verse) *is born of God*, ch. 4. v. 7.

we

we must thence gather that *Brotherly Love* of it self, abstract from all *Believing*, and consequently from *believing that Jesus is the Messias*, is the only thing necessarily required of us to make us Christians; and so our Learned and Profound Arguer baffles himself, and ruines his own One Article.

Our Rambling Disputer tells us in the same place, that *St.* John *the Divine was a more Reverend Rector than the Rector of* Steeple: where, besides the Whimsical Conceitedness of the Stile, he humbly intimates that *he himself* is a *Reverend Rector*, for else he could not say, the other is *more Reverend*.

What he demands, p. 40 about those terms *the Son of God* and *the Messias*, I have answer'd in the foregoing Discourse.

I urged from Acts 8. 37. that *the Son of God* and *the Messias* are not terms of the same signification, because else the *Eunuch* could not say that he believ'd *Jesus Christ to be the Son of God*. To which he returns this fantastick Reply, *I think*, saith he, *they amount to somewhat more*, viz. *that Jesus Christ is The Christ*. Which hath not the least foundation in the *Original*, from whence only he can pretend to borrow it, and therefore we must look upon it as a mere Shuffle. And indeed afterwards he doth as good as confess it, for notwithstanding his *thinking* it to be a good Reply, he unthinks it, but puts us off with an other groundless Conceit, (the same that the *Vindicator* had made use of) *viz.* that *Jesus Christ is used in the New Testament as a Proper Name*, as if only his *being call'd Jesus* or *Christ* was the

ſenſe of thoſe places where the words *Jeſus* and *Chriſt* are ſo often mention'd in Scripture.

At the concluſion of all, I muſt own myſelf obliged to this *Dorſet-ſhire* Gentleman for any thing that he hath ſai'd of me in ſome places of his laſt Papers that looks Reſpectfully and Civilly, and in a ſtrain above what I expected or deſired. Wherefore, abſtracting from our preſent Debate, I am ready at all times to expreſs the Deference which I owe to his Perſon and Office, and more over I aſſure him that I am in perfect Charity with him and all men, though there is no Conſideration whatſoever can bribe me to a concealment of my diſlike of his preſent Enterprize.

Brief Reflections on a late pretended Answer *of a Nameless* Socinian *to a Discourse, entituled,* The Socinian Creed.

THe *Double-column'd* Gentlemen begin to appear again, and one of them hath publish'd a Pamphlet which he calls at a venture *The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholick Church*, &c. And truly I am to own with great thankfulness the honour he doth me there of joyning me with Three Learned *Prelates* of our Church. I am bound to make some Return for this extraordinary kindness, and perhaps he may meet with it somewhere in this Paper. But this I must needs add that he is *too* lavish and excessive in his favours when he gives me the *Preference* to those Eminent Persons both in his *Title* and his *Book*: for the First part of this Learned Scrible bears this Inscription, *An Answer to Mr. Edwards*, wherin the Nameless Author pretends to say something with relation to a Book which I lately committed to the publick view, entitul'd *The Socinian Creed*: in which I first gave a brief, but impartial Account of those Erroneous and Unsound Principles which are ge-

generally eſpous'd by the *Foreign* and *Engliſh Socinians*; and then I ſhew'd the proper Tendency of them to Irreligion and Atheiſm.

So that according to this Diſtribution of my Work, the *Socinian* Brother who undertook to *anſwer* it was obliged in the firſt place either to confeſs that thoſe Principles and Tenents were owned by that Party of men both at home and abroad, or elſe to prove that they were not. And then, as to the Other Diviſion of my Task, he was bound either to acknowledg that the *Socinian* Principles and Doctrines have a Tendency to Irreligion and Infidelity, or elſe he was under a neceſſity of ſhewing that they have no ſuch thing. Any man of good reaſon and ſenſe would expect theſe things from him, and accordingly let us ſee what this Anonymous Writer hath done, and thence gather whether he hath acted the part of an *Anſwerer*, which he took upon him.

As to the firſt Part it is plain before the Readers eyes that this Pamphleteer is ſo far from diſowning *moſt* of thoſe Articles and Doctrines which I fix'd upon the *Socinians*, and from charging me with wronging them in aſſerting that the *Foreign* and *Engliſh Socinians* defend theſe very Articles in their Writings, he is ſo far (I ſay) from this that in effect he acknowledges to the world that they are the very doctrines and ſentiments of thoſe perſons, and that they are *worded* in that very manner as I ſet them down, and that the Authors whom I quoted deliver'd them in thoſe very terms, and that I have not miſrepreſented any of them. Which undeniably appears from this,

this, that he undertakes not to invalidate *any one* of my References or Quotations. If I had in the least perverted the sense and meaning of any single *Socinian* Writer that I produced, if I had in any degree falsified in my Citation of them, I should most certainly have heard it from this Gentleman in this his last Effort, especially when he particularly mentions my *References* and *Quotations*. p. 3. Out of that vast number of them which I made use of he would not have failed to set down one Instance at least, if he could have met with it, of my injuring the *Racovian* Authors by falsly alledging their Writings.

But so it is, there is not one single Quotation or Reference, which I brought to prove and confirm what I avouched concerning the *Socinians*, that he excepts against; which most assuredly he would have done, if there had been the least ground imaginable for it. And 'tis certain that he had *Time* enough to do it, since I publish'd what I writ, if the thing had been any ways feasible: and I suppose it will be granted that he wanted not *Will* to effect it. So then from his not doing it, nor so much as attempting it we may conclude his utter Inability and hereby he doth as good as grant that the *Socinians* are guilty of All they stand charg'd with by me in the *Socinian Creed*. He lets the world know that I have done them right, and that I have father'd nothing upon them falsly. He vouches the Truth of my Collections, he asserts the faithfulness of my Testimonies and Proofs out of the Original Authors. By all which he arraigns

raigns and convicts himself, and stabs his own Cause. And yet this he calls an *Answer to me.* Let the Reader judg of the Consistency of these things, and thence form a suitable Idea of this Wild and Senseless Undertaker.

Then, as to the *other* Articles of the *Socinian Creed*, it is observable that he is loath to let the world know by a formal Confession from him that he and his Friends allow of those doctrines, and therefore he betakes himself to the wonted way of Shuffling, Equivocating and Dissembling; and indeed he performs this part to a Wonder, and almost exceeds the late *Vindicator* in this excellent faculty. It is pleasant to see how he higgles and dodges. says and unsays, hath neither regard to the Truth, nor to what he saith himself. But we must not think this strange, for that man will take the liberty to contradict himself who is Resolved to do so to others. Nay, it cannot escape the Reader's observation that this Anonymous Scribe, merely to avoid the Imputation of some Articles I fastned on the *Socinians*, ventures to renounce what the most Considerable and Staunch men of that Party, yea what the *Modern* and *Domestick Socinians* have in express terms asserted:

Of which I will give one instance (though there are several others:) *He may for our parts*, saith he, *be Anathema that teaches or believes that doctrine*, viz *that there is no Merit in what Christ did or suffered, and that he made not Satisfaction for our sins* p. 7. Yet one of the First-Rate *Racovians* tells us that it was taught by *Socinus* and his brethren in plain and direct words

words, that * *the Opinion of those is false, absurd and pernicious who have feigned that there is any such thing as Merit in Christ.* And this Author himself speaking of Christs *Merit* and *Satisfaction* pronounces them † *Fiction, a Deceitful opinion, erroneous and very dangerous.* And the *English Socinians* at this day (of whom our present Penman without a Name is one) declare their disbelief and abhorrence of this Perswasion, *viz.* that Christ *Merited* and *Satisfied* for us. In one of their late Prints they let us know that || *the Oblation which Christ made of himself was not made to the Justice of God, or by way of Reparation, but, as all other Sacrifices,* (viz. of Beasts) *by way of humble suit. And* (which is more) these men have scoffed at and ridiculed the *Merits* and *Satisfaction* of our Blessed Lord, as the Reader may satisfy himself in the *Letter of Resolution concerning the doctrine of the Trinity.* p. 7. And *the Antitrinitarian Scheme of Religion*, p. 18. and *a Letter to the Clergy of both Universities.* chap. 6. and 8. all which I have particularly and distinctly quoted in the account of the *Socinian Creed.* And it is well known that in several others of their Pamphlets they have derided and exposed the *Merit* and *Satisfaction* of our Saviour: and yet now they *Anathematize* those that do so.

Which, with abundance of other the like Instances in this last attempt of theirs, shews

* *Smalc. cont. Frantz. Disput.* 4 † *Homil* 4. *in* 1 *Johan. Catechism de morte Christi. Qu.* 12. || The Antitrinitarian Scheme of Religion. *p.* 18.

a Profligate ſort of Writers they are. They are not afraid to call down a *Curſe* upon their own heads: and with their *Execrations* they mix the moſt palpable and notorious *Falſhoods*, and thereby convince us that they have abandoned all Faith and Integrity, that they are under an obſtinate reſolution to debauch their Underſtandings, to abuſe their Reaſons and Conſciences, and to impoſe upon the world.

We muſt either ſay this of them, or elſe (which I would be moſt willing to believe) that they are diſpoſed to a *Recantation*, and are inclin'd to relinquiſh ſeveral of thoſe Articles which they ſtifly mantain'd before. I hope it will be improv'd into a full ſincere Renuntiation. However, I have gain'd this Point; that I have brought them to Retract in words at leaſt, ſome of the Articles of *their Creed*. It is worthy of our Remark that whereas in ſome of their firſt Prints they anſwer'd very tamely to the name of *Socinians*, now this Gentleman throws off this Character, and will no longer bear that Badg: which ſhews that they are Changeable, and deſign ſome New model, and have a mind to have it graced with a New Title. Our Nameleſs Trimmer proclaim his *Agreement with the Catholick Church*, and very orthodoxly he would ſeem to talk concerning *the Incarnation of Chriſt* and ſome other Doctrines, p. 25, 26, *&c.* as if he were inclin'd to tack about, and leave the *Socinian* quarters. Whatever he intends, this is plain that he confutes himſelf and his Party, and then he calls it an *Anſwer*

swer to me. Indeed these are the best sort of *Answers* a man woud desire: and to say Truth, the Party cannot afford any other.

But behold the Inconsistent Folly and Stupidity of the Man! Though he frankly submits to my References and Citations, and even throws up some of the Articles of his own *Creed*, yet he is pleased to charge me with *Infamations* in the Title-page of his book. An Intelligent person would think that those Great and Undeniable Truths which I had asserted in my late Treatise are neither *Infamations* nor *Defamations*, they being founded upon Reason, Antiquity, and Scripture. Nor could the several members of the Inditement which I drew up against the *Socinians* deserve that Name which he uses, because he himself owns the greatest part of them to be True. Wherefore all that can be said is that *Infamations* is a dainty term that he is much taken with, and accordingly he resolv'd that it should come in some where, right or wrong, into his Papers; and where better than in the Front of them, to make up the *Raree Show?* But if we will attend to the true import and meaning of the word there, it is this, that the *Socinian* Doctrines are *Infamous*, and that I had rightly represented them as *such*, and that this Writer, who dare not shew his head, or subscribe his Name, is not able to disprove *either* of these things. Thus it is the deserved Lot of this sort of men that the more they write the more they expose themselves, and discover to world the Incoherence of their Assertions, the Vanity of their Pretences, the

Weakneſs of their Judgment, the Strength of their Prejudice, and above all the Badneſs of their Deſigns and Projects, which all Wiſe and good Men ſee and abhor.

Next, as to the Second Part of my late Diſcourſe, it is to be obſerv'd that he makes no Reply to the imputation of that *Tendency to Irreligion and Atheiſm* which I ſo often urged, and as often proved againſt the men of *Racovia*, and the very *Engliſh Unitarians*. And indeed I was not ſingular in this Impeachment of them, for I evinc'd it to be the perſwaſion of Others (of Great Judgment and Sagacity) that ſundry of the *Socinian* Opinions have a natural Vergency to *Infidelity* and *Impiety*, and one that hath writ ſince, and profeſſes to the treat the Socinians with *Civility and Good Temper* (and would be ſo treated by them again, as he beſpeaks their kindneſs in his *Preface*) is not ſhie of uſing this very language, but in plain and downright terms tells us that * *the generall Principle on which the body of Socinianiſm turns is of that nature that it advances the moſt Abſurd, and withal the moſt Impious and Blaſphemous Propoſition imaginable.* And in another place, *As from a Socinian it is eaſy to commence a Deiſt, ſo he that is once a Deiſt is in a hopeful way to be an Atheiſt whenever he pleaſes.* And afterwards thus, in his Addreſs to the *Socinians*, *The Conſequence of your Principle*, (viz. That nothing is to be believ'd but what they can comprehend) *leads you not only out of Chriſtianity, but out of all Religion*

* Mr. Norris's Account of Reaſon and Faith, p. 13.

ligion whether Natural or Revealed, even beyond Deism, even into Atheism it self. And again he tells them, that *their Principle of believing nothing but what they can comprehend directly leads to Atheism.* It seems then that though *Atheism* be voted by some a *Rude* and *Unmannerly* word, and though *Atheist* be thought to be an *Ungenteel* term, (wherefore the Plausible and Modish Stile of [*Deist*] *is used*, and is **a Name that gains reputation among all such as hate Religion, but know not how otherwise to distinguish themselves from profess'd Atheists, which they would by no means be taken for*) though, I say, the Title of *Atheist* be not modish and fine enough for some mens mouths, yet we see that this Gentleman, who † remonstrates with some Passion against that Rudeness of Stile which he espies in some Writers, and particularly engages before hand to shew himself *Civil* to the *Socinians*, yet boggles not in the least at this way of Expression, but with great freedom and boldness declares it to be his Opinion and Belief that these men are in the next capacity to be *Atheists*, and that their Principles and Doctrines directly lead to *Atheism*, as well as to *Impiety* and *Blasphemy*. And that we may know he is in good earnest, he repeats this over and over again. This is the very thing which I undertook to prove in my late Discourse (and I hope to the satisfaction of every unbiass'd Reader) by that plentiful Enumeration and Induction

* Bishop of *Worcester*'s Pref. to his Vind. of the Doctrine of the Trinity. † Pref. to the Account of Reason and Faith.

of Particulars which I offer'd, whence I demonstrated that a great number of the *Socinian Articles* naturally tend to the promoting of Irreligion and Prophaneneſs, and even to the effacing of the Senſe of a Deity.

But what ſaith our preſent Author to this, who hath taken upon him the Office of an *Anſwerer*? Why truly he Skulks, and hides his baffled head, and hath not one ſyllable to ſay for himſelf, or againſt me. This is a new kind of *Anſwerer*, a Silent one, becauſe he is conſcious to himſelf that nothing can be offer'd. It is not to be doubted that if the foreſaid Charge could have been evaded any ways, he would have attempted it. Had there been any thing ſaid by me againſt his Party which he could have diſproved, queſtionleſs he would have undertaken it. Had there been any ſhew of Reaſon or Truth on his ſide, he would have let us known it. Had there been any Excuſe to be invented, he would not have fail'd to publiſh it, and that with open Mouth. Wherefore all perſons of Underſtanding muſt conclude that he acknowledges the Truth and Reality of what I objected to the *Socinians*, *viz.* that moſt of their Doctrines and Principles damp Religion, and nouriſh Vice, and foſter Atheiſtical and Licentious Practiſes: which is the thing that makes *Socinianiſm* ſo Faſhionable at this day, and gains it ſo many Proſelytes.

And now from the whole what a Strange Proſpect have we of the Undertaking of this Dough-

Doughty Champion for the *Socinian* Cause? I appeal to the Reader whether his Incoherent and Shatter'd Pamphlet can be call'd an *Answer*, and consequently whether the Men of *Racovia*, who have much pretended to Grammar and Criticism, speak Properly, ly, and (which is a higher Consequence) whether they have not abjured all Modesty in obtruding such a piece of work upon the world. This shews that their business is to make a Noise, whether there be any Sense or significancy go along with it or no. They make a great stir, but effect nothing; they are very busy, but yet to no purpose. This we may truly say, Their Heads are a proof, against some Philosophers, that there may be *Motion* where there is *Emptiness*. I promis'd the Gentlemen before hand that *if any thing substantial in the way of Reply were offer'd* by them, I would not be backward to meet the Answerer with a Rejoynder: but here is nothing that looks like it, he is so far from offering any thing of *Substance*, that he doth not so much as pretend to a *Shadow* of any thing that is of that nature. There is not one Proposition that I laid down which is shaken by him, and he hath not so much as started One Objection against all I writ, and yet he hath the Confidence and Effrontery to dub his Pamphlet an *Answer*.

But it may be this will end well, it seems to argue that the *Socinians* are drawn to the very dreggs, and have nothing to alledg in their behalf. This looks as if their Plenipotentiaries were inclined to a Treaty of Peace,

and were forward to put an end to the Seven Years War between the *Unitarians* and *Trinitarians*. For what can we think elſe when all their Ammunition is ſpent, and they can fight no longer? This Champion who was choſen and cull'd out of the whole Hoſt of the *Unitarians* to engage the Contrary Side, lets fall his Weapons. His Courage abates, and his Spirits flag and dwindle: He dares not grapple with the Arguments I propos'd, neither doth he produce any of his own. He raiſes no Exceptions againſt me nor takes any notice of mine againſt him. Nay, which is Wondrous and Aſtoniſhing, his Invention is ſo barren that he can't coyn any new Cavils againſt what I deliver'd, nor rally up any old ones. Thus when they have no Forces to bring into the field, the War muſt needs ceaſe. When they ſurrender their Gariſons and Holds (as I have ſhew'd they do) and fairly give up the Cauſe, what can we conclude but that they are coming over to us?

And as for my ſelf particularly, whatever the matter is, they are very Complaiſant, and ſurely they intend in a ſhort time to take me into their favour For though this Infallible Judge is pleas'd to tell the world that I have writ ſome *trifling books* (thoſe he means that I have writ againſt his Brethren of *Racovia*) and ſome *indifferent ones*, thoſe I ſuppoſe which I have writ againſt a *Friend* of theirs lately) yet out of abundant grace and goodwill, he vouchſafes to declare that ſomebody *hath been ſerviceable to the Common Chriſtianity by ſome Learned Books*, p. 17. (I wiſh I could

ſay

say as much of our Author): and again, that *he hath writ divers Good Books, and one Excellent one*, p. 3. Though one would be loth to take a Disciple of *Socinus* upon his bare word, and though it would be immodest and vainglorious to attribute or apply any such thing to my self, yet as it is the frank Testimony of an *Adversary*, who would not esteem it as a singular Mark of Favour? who would not resent these Obliging Kindnesses from an *Enemy*, especially when they are mixed with *Reflections*, as in the present case? for then it is a sign that the Approbation forced its way through Calumnies and Falshoods. In short, I perceive they have a mind to be Friends with me, they would have at least a Cessation of Arms, if I would agree to it.

On which occasion I will take leave to say, that I am most heartily Glad that I have appear'd in this Cause, maugre all the insults of the Adversaries; I thank the *Father of Lights* that he was pleas'd to dispose me to this Honourable Service, and in such a Juncture, when the whole *Posse* of the *Unitarians* and their *Allies* attack'd the Christian Faith with such Force and fury. When these *Granadiers* came on so fiercly, who could but expect an *Assault*? who was not sensible that Religion was invaded, and that Christianity it self was in extreme danger? It is a Comfortable Reflection to me that I have born up against the Bold Aggressors, and that I have, according to my mean powers, asserted and vindicated the Truth with that warmth and zeal which become every Christian Breast. And now I must

muſt tell them I ſcorn to flinch from ſo good a Cauſe as I have undertaken, and I will never ſubmit to gratify the humour and genius of *Deiſts* and *Scepticks*, or any Well-Willers to *Racovia*. Though I am as great an Admirer and Lover of *Civility* and *Good Temper* as any Man, yet I will never be bribed to a faint-hearted Relinquiſhing of the Truth. No: I will by the Divine Aid, vindicate the Religion of the New Teſtament, and the Faith of the Chriſtian Church in all ages, and that with open face. And particularly, as to what I laſt writ and publiſh'd, I will make it ſtand the ſhock of the moſt daring *Socinian* in *Chriſtendom*.

But to let theſe Gentlemen ſee that I am no *Man of Contention*, I declare to them that I am not averſe from complying with their Offers, if they be Sincere and in Good Earneſt, and if they reſolve not to violate their own Articles of Peace. I will forgive their *Colts teeth* (as this pleaſant Gentleman words it) if for the future they uſe not (as they have done in moſt of their Writings) *thoſe of the Bear*. And why indeed ſhould I contend with theſe *Catholick* and *Orthodox* Men? for that is the Stile now in their laſt Print. Who will fall out with thoſe that profeſs *Agreement with the Catholick Church*? But eſpecially the Title of *Orthodox* (which they ſo abhorr'd) is much courted by this Author, as the Reader cannot but obſerve. Which may be an occaſion to us to think that theſe Perſons are inclined to do ſomething to deſerve that *Name*. It is my hearty Prayer and Wiſh that they may

ſhew

ſhew themſelves to be of this number. And I promiſe them thus far to yield to the Terms of Peace, that if they renew not the Quarrel, and aſſault me not afreſh, this ſhall be our Laſt Campagne, and ſo here is an End to our Debates and Rencounters.

ER.

ERRATA.

PAge 8. Line 29. read *and if thoſe*, p. 11. l. 14. r. *Unreaſonably*, p. 12. l. penult. r. *which*, p. 13. l. 6. r. *numbers*, l. 11. r. *nor the*, p. 19. l. 15. r *him for*, p. 33. l. 22. r. *aſſented*, p. 34. l. 27. r. *task*, l. 31. for *they* r. *you*, p. 38. l. 21. r. *declare*, p. 39. l. 15. dele *the*, p 42. l. 20. r. *more to*, p. 46. l. r. *peruſe*, p. 56. l. 17. r. *owns*, p. 5-. l. 31. r. *bandied*, p. 64. l. 4. dele *and*, p. 75. l. 13. for *give* r. *go*, p. 94. l. 22. before *to* inſert *it*.

BOOKS written by the Reverend Mr. John Edwards.

AN Enquiry into ſeveral Remarkable Texts of the Old and New Teſtament which contain ſome Difficulty in them, with a Probale Reſolution of them, in two Vol. 8°.

A Diſcourſe concerning the *Authority*, *Stile* and *Perfection* of the Books of the Old and New Teſtament, with a Continued Illuſtration of ſeveral Difficult Texts throughout the whole Work. In three Vol. 8°.

Some Thoughts concerning the ſeveral Cauſes and Occaſions of Atheiſm, eſpecially in the Preſent Age, with ſome brief Reflections on Socinianiſm, and on a Late Book entituled, *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity as deliver'd in the Scriptures* 8°. price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

A Demonſtration of the *Exiſtence* and *Providence* of God from the Contemplation of the viſible Structure of the *Greater* and the *Leſſer World*. In two Parts. The firſt ſhewing the Excellent Contrivance of the *Heavens*, *Earth*, *Sea*, &c. The ſecond, the wonderful Formation of the Body of Man. 8°. price 4 *s*,

Socinianiſm Unmask'd: A Diſcourſe ſhewing the Unreaſonableneſs of a Late Writer's Opinion concerning the Neceſſity of only *One Article of Chriſtian Faith*, and of his other Aſſertions in his Late Book Entituled, *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity as deliver'd*

in

in the Scriptures, and in his *Vindication* of it; with a brief Reply to another (Profeſſed) Socinian Writer. 8°. price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Socinian Creed: Or a Brief Account of the profeſſed *Tenents* and *Doctrines* of the Forreign and *Engliſh Socinians*, wherein is ſhewed the Tendency of them to *Irreligion* and *Atheiſm*. With *Proper Antidotes* againſt them. 8°. price 3 *s.*

A Brief Vindication of the Fundamental Articles of the *Chriſtian Faith*, as alſo of the *Clergy*, *Univerſities*, and *Publick Schools* from Mr. *Lock*'s Reflections upon them. With ſome Animadverſions on two other late Pamphlets, *viz.* of Mr. *Bold* and a Nameleſs *Socinian* Writer. 8°. price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

Brief Remarks upon Mr. *Whiſton*'s *New Theory of the Earth*: and upon another Gentleman's *Objections* againſt ſome Paſſages in a Diſcourſe *of the Exiſtence and Providence of God*, relating to the *Copernican Hypotheſis*. 8°. price 6 *d.*

BOOKS

BOOKS Printed for Jonathan Robinſon, *and* John Wyat.

A Practical Expoſition on the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, in two Volumes, in *Quarto.*

The Vanity of the World, with other Sermons, in *8vo.*

Sermons or Diſcourſes on ſeveral Scriptures, in Four Volumes, in *Octavo.*

The Almoſt Chriſtian diſcovered, in ſome Sermons on *Acts* 26. 28. All theſe written by the Right Reverend Father in God *Ezekiel Hopkins*, late Lord Biſhop of *London-derry.*

Biſhop *Uſher*'s Life and Letters. By Dr *Parr*, in *Folio.*

——'s Body of Divinity, or the Sum and Subſtance of the Chriſtian Religion, *Folio.*

——'s 22 Sermons on ſeveral Subjects, *Fol.*

Joſephus's Hiſtory of the Jews, *Folio.*

Dr. *Bates*'s Harmony of the Divine Attributes, *Octavo.* 4*th* Edition, 1697.

Charron of Wiſdom, in three Books.

All Dr. Antony Walker's *Works*, viz.

The Sinfulneſs and Danger of delaying Repentance.

The Vertuous Woman, or the Life of the Counteſs of *Warwick.*

The

The Vertuous Wife, or the Life of Mrs. *Eliz. Walker.*

His Sermons of Water-drinking, Preached at *Tunbridge-wells*, &c.

The worthy Communicant, a Treatise shewing the due Order of Receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The 17th Edition. By *Jeremiah Dyke.* Newly reprinted 1697.

The Poor Doubting Christian drawn unto Christ. By *Thomas Hooker.*

Ovid's Metamorphosis, in *English* Verse. By *George Sandys.*

Æsop's Fables in Prose, with Cuts

Solitude improved by divine Meditation. By *Nathaniel Ranew*, late Rector of *Felsted* in *Essex.*

Practical Discourses concerning Death and Heaven. By *Nathaniel Ranew.*

Correction, Instruction, or a Treatise of Afflictions. By *Tho. Case.*

The Principles of Christian Religion, with a brief Method of the Doctrine thereof. By Bishop *Usher.*

The sinfulness of Sin, and the fulness of Christ, In two Sermons. By *W. Bridge.*

Brinsley's Posing of the parts reprinted 1697.

Sir *Simon D'ews* Journal of all Queen *Elizabeths* Parliaments, *Folio.*

Bacons Historical and Political account of the Government of *England.*

FINIS.